VOL. I, NO. 1 JANUARY 1923

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY

Editor:- ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

A REVIEW OF RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THOUGHT

CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES,
MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C.4.

Price Two Shillings & Sixpence net.

If Missionary Converts value Christianity why do they not support the work themselves?

They Do!

You are asked to make a note of the following:—

Last year's financial returns from the mission fields of

THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY

show that the Churches, Schools and Hospitals and other Institutions affiliated through the Society with our Congregational Churches contributed £144,000 towards the maintenance of work.

For every £1 of income received for work from supporters in Great Britain 19s. 9d. was contributed in the mission field.

You are invited also to remember:—

That in spite of this generous response abroad the L.M.S. requires an extra income of at least **£25,000** in order to avert deficiency.

Gifts of self-denial are sought. You are asked to make the urgent needs of your great Society known to your friends.

Behind this historic Missionary Society lie 128 years of consistent evangelistic service in the great mission field. Its work is more necessary than ever.

The L.M.S. Treasurer is
W. H. Somervell, Esq.

Contributions may be sent to:—

Rev. Nelson Bitton, Home Secretary, London Missionary Society, 48 Broadway, Westminster, London, S.W. 1

The Congregational Quarterly

Editor :
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board :
REV. ARTHUR PRINGLE.
REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.
THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.
All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at 50, Newick Road, Clapton, E. 5, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. I, No. 1 **JANUARY 1923**

CONTENTS

[*For biographical sketches of our contributors, see. p.* 19.]

A WELCOME TO *THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY* THOMAS YATES
EDITORIAL
THE WORLD'S NEED OF PEACE . . . . D. LLOYD GEORGE
THE "HOLY ALLIANCE" AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS . A. J. GRANT
GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY . . . . . VERNON BARTLET
THE MEANING OF THE DEATH OF JESUS . . A. D. BELDEN
THE JESUS OF HISTORY AND THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH C. HAROLD DODD
PREACHERS I HAVE KNOWN . . . . H. ARNOLD THOMAS
GATEWAYS TO THE WORLD . . . . . A. G. S.
INDUSTRIAL CHAOS AND THE WAY OUT . . . THOMAS FOSTER
A YOUNG CONGREGATIONALIST TO YOUNG CONGREGATIONALISTS . . . . . THE EDITOR
CONGREGATIONALISM AND LITERATURE.
NONCONFORMITY AND THE UNIVERSITY—I. OXFORD . W. B. SELBIE
DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—
THE CHANGING WORLD . . . . HERBERT BROOK
THE CHURCH MEETING AND REALITY . . C. ERNEST WATSON
HOW TO USE A DOWN-TOWN CHURCH . . M. O. PAULDEN
FOREIGN REVIEWS . . . . . W. BLACKSHAW
CURRENT LITERATURE:—By the EDITOR, Drs. G. B. GRAY, A. E. GARVIE, W. B. SELBIE, J. V. BARTLET, A. J. GRIEVE, Prof. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D., and Rev. E. SHILLITO, M.A.
SHORTER NOTICES PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

1923

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

NOTABLE BOOKS

PROGRESS IN RELIGION. By T. R. GLOVER, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Public Orator in the University. Demy 8vo, 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Wilde Lectures delivered at Oxford University surveying the factors that make for progress in men's religious ideas from primitive times up to the Christian era. The lectures deal from this point of view with Homer, Plato, the Hebrew Prophets, the Stoics, Roman Religion, etc.

"Written in such a way as to command the attention not only of professional students but of all who are interested in the religious problems of the day."—*Glasgow Herald.*

THE LORD OF THOUGHT. A Study of the Problems which confronted Jesus Christ and the Solution He offered. By Miss LILY DOUGALL, author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia,* and C. W. EMMETT, M.A., B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford. Demy 8vo, 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

This book is a study of the religious beliefs current in Judaism in the time of Christ and the originality of His teaching in relation to them. It is an apologetic on new lines for the uniqueness of Christianity and the supremacy of our Lord in the realm of thought.

"Both writers are well known and any work from their pens deserves serious study and consideration. They have produced a volume teeming with interest and of real theological importance which ought to be widely read."—CANON V. F. STORR in *Church Family Newspaper.*

Christ and the Kingdom of God. A Revised and Enlarged Edition. By Professor S. H. HOOKE, M.A., Victoria College, Toronto. Cloth, 4*s.* net. Paper, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

"Fuller of thought and matter than perhaps any modern book of its size known to us."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

The Fourth Gospel. Its Significance and Environment. By Rev. R. H. STRACHAN, M.A., D.D. 2nd Edition. Crown 8vo, 5*s.* net.

"Cannot fail to be of the greatest value. Admirable survey of the environment of the Fourth Gospel, Judaism, Stoicism, and the mystery religions; and also the remarkably lucid and suggestive exposition of the various main sections of the Gospel. We commend Mr. Strachan's book most warmly."—*The Westminster Gazette.*

The Desire of all Nations. By AUGUST CIESZKOWSKI, the Polish Philosopher, Politician, Economist, and Social Reformer. Translated by W. J. ROSE, M.A. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net.

"A fearless and independent thinker, whose freshness and originality fascinate an open-minded reader."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"A thinker of the type of Baron von Hügel. His book deserves deliberate reading."—*Glasgow Herald.*

The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience. By A. L. HUMPHRIES, M.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 5*s.*

"One of the most satisfying, helpful, and incidentally best-written theological books issued in recent years."—*Church Times.*

Vital Forces of the Early Church. By Prof. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.D., D.Sc. Crown 8vo, 4*s.*

"A book with much freshly put matter grouped under the heading of ideas specially prominent in the Early Church, viz. Equality, Fraternity, Liberty, Conversion, the New Age, the Second Coming, etc. Written by one of the leading authorities on the Apostolic Age."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

Can we Dispense with Christianity? The Question: Its Crux and Implications for the Modern Mind. By F. W. BUTLER. Crown 8vo, 5*s.* net.

"A scholarly and closely reasoned attempt to prove the uniqueness and absoluteness of Christianity from the philosophical side. . . . We commend the whole argument to all who take religion seriously enough to study the philosophical side of it."—*Christian World.*

Write for New Detailed Publication List.

32 Russell Square, London, W.C. 1.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Rev. THOMAS YATES, Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Trained at Didsbury, became a Congregationalist, and after successful pastorates in Belfast and Liverpool, succeeded Silvester Horne at Kensington in 1905, since which date he has exercised an ever-widening ministry.

Rt. Hon. D. LLOYD GEORGE, O.M., M.P., Prime Minister, 1916–22.

Professor ARTHUR JAMES GRANT, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Leeds since 1896. The author of Histories of Europe, books on the French Monarchy, the Age of Pericles, etc., he combines wide learning, with eloquent speech, and democratic sympathies.

Rev. J. VERNON BARTLET, M.A., D.D., Professor of Church History at Mansfield College since 1889; a leading authority on all matters relating to the Apostolic Age.

Rev. A. D. BELDEN, B.D., a Congregational minister, trained at New College, now at Westcliff. Writes on social and theological topics, and for children.

Rev. C. HAROLD DODD, M.A., Yates Professor of N.T. Greek at Mansfield College, formerly minister at Warwick. Author of a fresh and illuminating volume, *The Meaning of Paul for To-day*, in the "Christian Revolution" Series.

Rev. H. ARNOLD THOMAS, M.A., LL.D., the beloved pastor of Highbury, Bristol, for nearly fifty years, and greatly esteemed by all his brethren for his cultured witness and devoted life.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER, an employer of labour in the Building Trade, prominent in all projects for re-organizing industry. Responsible for the "Foster Report" on Building Trade Management.

Rev. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D., Principal of Mansfield, after ministries at Highgate and Cambridge. Exercises great influence on undergraduate life in Oxford and on thinking people in all the Churches. Has written biographies of A. M. Fairbairn and C. Silvester Horne, as well as volumes on Schleiermacher, etc.

Rev. HERBERT BROOK, M.A., formerly held Congregational pastorates in Accrington and Liverpool.

Rev. C. ERNEST WATSON, trained at Lancs. College, now Congregational minister at Rodborough.

Miss M. O. PAULDEN, minister-in-charge of Berkeley Congregational Church, Liverpool.

Rev. W. BLACKSHAW, M.A., B.Sc., B.D., pastor at Highgate, interested in social problems; widely read in foreign theology.

A MESSAGE

FROM

THE REV. R. J. WELLS

A WIDE welcome undoubtedly awaits the new venture of a CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, a welcome that will be accorded by many readers, each regarding it from his own standpoint of interest or expectancy.

None, however, should be warmer in their welcome than those who regard it as our denominational organ, seeking to knit more closely the loose ends of our work for the Kingdom of God, endeavouring to focus, by helpful suggestion, constructive criticism and enlightening comment, the interest and co-operation of all its readers on the manifold services the Union is rendering to the Churches of our Order. As such we welcome it.

Whatever may be our debt to the existing religious Press, it of necessity caters for *news*. Grateful for what it is doing, we cannot expect from it, for obvious reasons, the space wherein to propound, discuss, or inform in regard to those plans and purposes that more intimately concern the well-being and well-doing of Congregationalism. In the pages of the QUARTERLY there will be this opportunity, and with a wise use of such we may rightly anticipate a real accession of strength to all our denominational enterprises, and the creation of an *esprit de corps* that shall make our fraternal fellowship as Independents as strong and firm as any bonds that bind sister communions.

If this is true as regards our work in the Motherland, it is still more so when we lift our eyes to the wider horizons and think of our co-religionists who have passed to earth's remotest bounds. What corporate Congregationalism means to our sister Unions in Canada, South Africa, Australasia, and how in vital ways in response to their appeals we are from time to time serving them, few among us know, nor hitherto without a medium of communication could the knowledge be given. And what is true of organized Congregationalism Overseas is true in an added degree of all the multifold, remote and far-scattered Congregational Churches and lonely sons and daughters who have gone from our Churches to the fringes of the Empire. They think more often of us than I fear we do of them.

In this great field of untold importance to the future of the English-speaking race, the Colonial Missionary Society, as *our* department of ministry to our own kinsfolk overseas, is rendering a remarkable and steadily progressive service. Rightly it more and more represents organized Congregationalism to our kith and kin in the regions beyond. It does for us in its clearly defined limits what we could ill do, and its support and extension is thus doubly our responsibility. We owe it to those who have gone out bearing our name, and we owe it to the Society that undertakes the task on our behalf. The stronger the Society the stronger will be the worldwide witness in which we as Congregationalists believe.

This magazine, as it proves of real vital worth, as we believe it will, cannot fail to assist the Colonial Missionary Society. The Society will use and spread its pages, and the QUARTERLY will be as another shuttle in the loom of its far-reaching toil, carrying a fresh thread that shall help bind these distant souls more closely to the God of their fathers and to the Church of their childhood.

The Congregational Quarterly

A WELCOME TO "THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY"

BY THE CHAIRMAN OF
THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES

In announcing the founding of this Journal the Editor and his colleagues have described their intention with such explicitness that the prospectus is itself adequate introduction. I am not expected to supply a superfluous placard. Can the Editorial ideal be made to actualize? "The dream and the business" are rarely easy to translate into equivalents, especially perhaps when the business is that of producing a journal sound and vital enough to make for itself the place it has had the courage to claim.

But the lot is not cast into the lap of the Editor alone. What waits to be seen is whether there is, in the constituency it is hoped to interest and help, enough readiness and alertness for the movements of thought in our time to welcome and sustain effectively this undertaking. This is perhaps not a fair stating of the matter, for it assumes that we are none of us readers of the established journals and reviews of honourable place, some of which have long attained to the dignity of institutions. The question which will be answered quickly is whether a journal dealing with the living and moving thought of the day, *as it acts and reacts upon the mind and outlook of our own Congregational people and Churches*, and of our sister Free Churches, can discharge a function of value, and enter widely and deeply into our common mind and corporate life.

A journal must stand on its own worth, and never presume upon denominational loyalty. But it may justly make some modest claim upon this loyalty, at any rate for a beginning, and it may thereby do some incidental service in developing a quality which is not noticeably in excess among us.

There is no doubt about our need for an organ of news and opinions, of discussion of passing questions and common enterprises.

48621

How great is our disability, lacking such a weekly organ, many of us keenly realize, for we have no means of swift communication or interchange of opinion concerning proposals and purposes. This Journal cannot meet that need. It is not meant as a substitute for something very different. It has another function and purpose. It will deal with ideas and not with news, though in truth there is no news in the long run so important as news about ideas. It will deal with movements of thought and service, and not with persons. We drive hard on practice, and rightly. We are awaking to evangelism. We are exploring and moving out upon the social, national and international implications of the gospel. But these activities of Christian life and service have to be kept in touch, not only with the springs of spiritual resource, but with the springs of intellectual inquiry and enlightenment. Down into the mind's integrity run all these questions which on the face of them often seem matters simply of goodwill, or of practical statesmanship, or of energetic initiative. But getting things done rightly depends usually on getting things thought rightly. We have an example in the movement towards the unity of the Churches. To secure the good end we must "do something." Speedily it was clear that an amount of hard clear thinking and re-thinking must come first. The high appeal was discovered to hold ambiguities, and there is no unity along the path of no-meaning, or of two meanings to any one vital thing. It is so with all our practicalities of service, and those who can quicken and fertilize the mind of the Church are ministers of an indispensable grace.

Decently and effectively interred in the book of the proceedings of "The Fourth International Congregational Council" is a commission report on "The Contributions of British Congregationalism in the Field of Religious Thought: Our Present Strength and Weakness in that Field." The sonorous title has a little barb in its tail. The report is a little heavy-going, but it is wholesome reading. It makes very clear how our Churches have held their place and way in the central current of positive Protestant faith as this developed in the clash of thought and the growing light of the Spirit in the minds of men. These scholars and thinkers of our stock struck no sail to fear, but brought to harbour good harvesting from the deep waters. It is a good succession of captains courageous. Their names and their achievements in learning, in literature and in life any religious community might well be proud to claim. And they have not all passed with Dale, Fairbairn and Forsyth. Nor do all we have of such order stand yet in fame as doctors of the Church. Within the space of a few years immediately past we have had contributions to theology, to the history of doctrine, to Biblical research, as valuable and distinctive as can be matched in any language. Not a few of these have come from

younger scholars of our own who are engaged in the full activities of ministerial or similar service.

The specific Congregational contribution to religious thought is not disappearing from the life of the Church, and it is good to have valuations of such work from others beyond our communion. But we want to have our own say about these. They belong to us and we to them, and we want them to know we are aware of what they do, to offer them their due meed when they bring gifts to the store of the Church, to discuss with freedom from our own point of view the thought and conclusions of our own writers. We want a channel open for them to reach us with more of their gifts. We would like to know if there are more of their kind than we have discovered in our company. Welcome, then, to a journal planned as this is, to be a centre of expression for as many as have real things to write about things that really matter!

Not only in such ranges of sacred learning, but in the ranges of wider literature, on the problems of education and of social theory and practice, we can do well with a tribune. That report referred to, which now sleeps in peace, affirmed that these fields lie fallow with us, and I may exhume this sentence which seems too living to be buried: "If our Congregationalist reverence for individual conviction, joined with our Congregationalist joy in Christian fellowship"—it may be added, our Congregationalist alertness and daring of mind—"cannot throw light upon the problems of the twentieth century, where may such light be looked for?"

With which query this commendation of the new venture may end, and the Journal itself take up the running. Open country of thought, inquiry and action is before it, and it will take its way with wide-mindedness, looking, as Carlyle said, "fearlessly toward all the thirty-two points of the compass, whithersoever and howsoever it listeth."

THOMAS YATES.

EDITORIAL

In 1886 Dr. A. B. Davidson, whose *Hebrew Grammar* has been an affliction unto many, wrote to a correspondent concerning the Church to which he belonged :—

> We are just now in this country in a very sorry plight. We have absolutely no organ, journal, or even paper through which we can communicate with one another, or in which any of us can lay before others anything occurring in our reading or reflection that might interest them, or pass a judgment or criticism on any work of importance belonging to the special department with which any of us might be connected.

These words exactly describe British Congregationalism a generation later, and therefore the Congregational Quarterly has come into being. We are pleased to know that many have the feeling that Davidson expressed in the continuation of his letter ; they are " glad that . . . this defect, which for a number of years has been very seriously felt, is now going to be remedied."

Our prospectus stated our aims and ideals at some length, and there is no need to repeat them. We believe that a journal of this kind can be of real service to religion, to scholarship, and to the denomination which it would especially serve. All that helps to clarify thought, to suggest new ideas, and to stimulate discussion, is of value to-day. The religious world, alike in the spheres of thought and action, is in a ferment, and there is need for calm counsel, thorough research, and adequate consideration on every side.

So many fields are ripe for harvest that Congregationalists must inevitably have some reaping to perform. Whether we look at Christology or psychology, at the period between the Old and New Testaments or at the Early Church, we cannot but marvel at the accomplishments of scholars during the last generation and at the prospect for students in the days immediately before us. This Journal, we trust, will not only help to estimate and broadcast the scholarship of the time, but will also have its own positive contributions to make. For example, is our knowledge of the Eastern religions ever going to be brought into relation with the mythology of Greece and of Rome, with the masses of information given to us in *The Golden Bough*, and with all that has been revealed of Babylonian and Assyrian thought and practice ?

Or, if a practical illustration is desired, is it not necessary that our Congregational principles should be clarified, that the relation of the individual Church to the one Church should be discussed,

and a policy beaten out which combines the Catholic and Independent ideas of the Church? These are but some of the quarries in which Congregationalists might usefully labour. There need be no unemployment amongst Christian thinkers to-day, and the prepared stone may be made into literal temples for these pages!

* * *

MANY inquiries concerning this Journal asked about our relation to the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It is only right to make clear that the Union is not responsible for opinions expressed in the editorial or other pages; that would indeed be a burden too grievous to be borne! On the other hand, the CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY holds itself entirely free for comment and discussion on all denominational affairs. It is neither an apologist for Headquarters, as some perhaps desire, nor is it a front-line trench in which all those can take refuge who delight in attacking an established institution. If our Journal can do anything to make the Churches we love more effective for the bringing in of Christ's Kingdom, we serve our purpose. Sometimes, of course, we may be compelled to criticize movements and policies; sometimes we may have to act as a Socratic gadfly to the denomination, and use Dean Inge's words: "We do not like being unpleasant, but if no one else will and the time requires . . ."; but all our criticism will be constructive, and motived entirely by the sincere desire to make our organized Congregationalism worthy of its Lord.

In short, the CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY has no axe to grind. It is neither the mouthpiece of denominational officials nor the safety valve of denominational critics. Its aim is simply to serve the Congregational Churches, and, through them, truth and righteousness, and the Kingdom of God.

* * *

THE world we live in must be very remote from actuality if all the criticisms we hear about the present-day pulpit are true. Mr. Arthur Porritt, for example, tells us in his racy book of reminiscences, reviewed later in these pages, that the rich man still exercises too much influence in the Free Churches, and implies that our pulpit teaching has always the wealthy supporter in mind. Dr. Parkes Cadman speaks thus:—

> English Christians put no heart into their attack on the drink traffic. Ministers are not so outspoken as they might be. They are never sure whether there is not a brewer in the third pew.

We do not believe there is much foundation for either of these statements. There are very few brewers in any of the pews, third or other, in the Free Churches, and the average minister would not keep silent if his church were crowded with them!

Dr. Cadman's criticism is like that of the Socialist orator who has still as part of his ordinary stock-in-trade the statement that the Churches are entirely concerned with the next world and have nothing to say about the injustices of this! The orator in question has probably never been inside a church for a generation, and his criticism is altogether out-of-date. Dr. Cadman's is equally so, and Mr. Porritt's is, we think, so far behind the times that some ministers to-day could probably be accused of giving needless offence by indiscriminate attacks on wealth and employers of labour!

Nor do we think there is as wide a chasm between the study and the pulpit as is often supposed. Ministers generally attempt with tact and with care the difficult task of leading their people to a right understanding of the findings of scholarship concerning the Bible and Christian truth, and the number of cases of pulpit insincerity that have come to our notice is strikingly few. Probably a more legitimate line of criticism is that many ministers themselves fail to keep abreast of modern teaching, but for that the Churches are not without their share of responsibility. The minister who has to preach three times a week and also be the managing director of the business of his Church often has very little time for the kind of reading that ought to engage his attention. When he has prepared his sermons, done necessary pastoral visitation, attended numerous committees and settled innumerable details, there is little time or strength left for Dr. R. H. Charles on the *Revelation*, even if there be means to purchase that exhaustive and exhausting work.

* * *

In the midst of many good things we imagine that most delegates to our Autumnal Assembly will remember best the addresses of Dr. Grenfell and Mr. Angus Watson. Dr. Grenfell just talked to us in simple phrase about his work, but every word told because there was a real man behind it. There was no attempt at rhetoric, but the ring of sincerity and the power of a life of consecrated service were better than a thousand perorations. We are glad to be able to announce that an article from Dr. Grenfell's pen will appear in our next issue.

The head of a large business who has ideals that he is translating into practice is naturally heard with great respect, and Mr. Watson's address, which has been published by our Social Service Department, was as able as it was interesting and suggestive. We believe that the way out of the industrial impasse is to be found along the path suggested by him and by Mr. Foster in our own pages. There must be general recognition of the fact that, in the words of the Archbishop's Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems,

there is no moral justification for profits which exceed the amount needed to pay adequate salaries to the management, a fair rate of interest on the capital invested, and such reserves as are needed to ensure and maintain the highest efficiency of production and the development and growth of the industry. . . . It is the duty of Christians [to see] that after the necessary charges upon industry mentioned above have been made any surplus should be applied to the benefit of the whole community.

We do not know whether Mr. Watson and Mr. Foster would agree with the second sentence ; from Mr. J. A. R. Marriott's article in the October *Hibbert Journal* it is clear that many members of the Church of England do not. Mr. Marriott writes with considerable pungency and force, but we do not believe much progress will be made by talking at this time of the day about " inexorable economic laws," or by suggesting that the followers of Jesus should concern themselves with individuals only and not with the problems of social life.

* * *

We are greatly indebted to Dr. Jowett for crystallizing the opinion of Christian people in regard to peace. The fact that the Rev. B. J. Snell seconded the League of Nations resolution at the Hull Assembly is an indication of the distance we have travelled during the last few years ! But resolutions in themselves, no matter how strongly worded and how enthusiastically carried, are of little use, and what is needed is for the Church of Christ to think out its ethic in regard to war and prepare a programme of action so that its forces may be speedily and effectively mobilized if war threaten. The followers of the Prince of Peace must not be caught napping " next time." On Peace Sunday 1913 all our pulpits proclaimed the Gospel of Peace ; even on Sunday, August 2, 1914, they did the same. Then came division, and the 100 per cent. of Christians who did not believe in war one week dwindled to a handful the next. Time and again war comes ; in the intervals between we announce our Peace message ; then, when the crucial moment arrives, almost with one voice we say : " We must see our country through this trouble " ; and the cycle recurs once more. The Church of Christ must not shirk its plain duty. It must decide its policy and prepare its programme. Not long ago there was a pathetic moment in denominational history. A proposal to appoint a Commission to investigate the teaching of Christians in regard to war was made, and men of standing were found to rise and say : " Oh ! we must not discuss that ; we shall be divided." Well, if the Church of Christ has no definite teaching to give on such a fundamental subject as war, " Ichabod " may be written over our doors, for the glory has indeed departed. If we cannot by consecration of mind and heart get such a knowledge of our Lord's guidance on this matter that we can speak with the authority

with which He spoke, the sooner we abdicate our function and proclaim to the world our inability to perform our office the better. It is no use waiting until the dark clouds of war are over us. Now is the time for hard thinking, for if the Churches do not keep the world at peace nothing else will. We suggest to Dr. Jowett that he might lead the way not only to demonstrations of the whole Church in favour of peace, but also in bringing to bear the consecrated and concentrated intellect of the Christian world on this subject, so that we may have a clear lead to give.

* * *

What applies to peace applies in full measure to other spheres of modern life. The world is in confusion and chaos, and longing for leadership. Was ever a people in a greater fog than the British public in the days before the General Election? Unfortunately, the Church of Christ is in an equally distracted state; divided against herself, she speaks with no certain sound, and it is time we recognized that a Church that does not know its own mind can neither guide mankind nor save the world. Her first need, therefore, is to consecrate her intellect, and do some deep, hard thinking, so that she may shed a clear and shining light on the pathway of lost and wandering souls. Action similar to that of the Temperance Council of the Christian Churches should be taken at once. A definite policy has been beaten out, and the Churches have before them an immediate objective and an ultimate aim; the campaign has been planned both in the wider field of strategy and in all its tactical details. Cannot the same method be adopted in kindred matters? Consider just two of the problems where this is especially necessary at the moment:—

(*a*) *Amusements.*—During the week, what amusements ought the Church to provide for young people? All? Or none? If some, where is the line to be drawn, and who is to draw it? If billiards, why not cards? If cards, why not dances? And what is to be the attitude of the Church toward Sunday and the demand for pictures, concerts, games? We are asked why it should be wrong to run and kick on Sunday, if it is right to walk, and to these and other questions we have no answer, because we have not thought out the problem and formulated a policy.

(*b*) *The Relation of the Sexes.*—Here is an important sphere of life where men need guidance, where the Church, through timidity and cowardice, has neglected its duty. If she is to count in the world, three things at least she must do:—

(1) Insist that Christian parents inform their children of the facts of life and sex at or before the age of puberty. At present they are allowed to pick up knowledge anywhere and anyhow, and often young lives are spoiled that might have been kept pure had not parents shirked a plain task.

(2) Give guidance to the married in order to remove profound ignorance and correct lamentable error. Let the Church compare the quantity of impure and misleading literature disseminated during the last decade with its own output, and be ashamed.
(3) Study the question of divorce, and proclaim to men the modern Christian attitude in regard to it.

* * *

THE proceedings of the Federal Council in September in regard to Christian Union did not carry us much further on the way, though it was good for us to have a frank and explicit account of the discussions with representatives of the Anglican Church. We have full confidence in our representatives on the Council, and are not prepared to believe—as some hasty and ill-informed critics apparently are—that they are going to "sell the pass." It is both necessary and wise, however—no matter what the ultimate fate of the negotiations may be—that the rank and file of the denomination be kept fully informed of the nature of the conversations. We have as little faith in secret diplomacy in ecclesiastical as in international affairs! Let Congregationalists know what is suggested, and why; let them hear continually the trend of the discussions, and the views of their representatives thereon. Then opinion in the Churches can be developed *pari passu* with that in the Council itself, and the final proposals can be considered without prejudice and on their merits by minds educated and informed.

Will the desired union come about until we have defined what a Christian Church really is? Do we not need still to emphasize that in the last resort a Christian Church has two essential constituents, and two only—the Christ who is the object of faith and the Christian people who believe in Him? The Church invisible is composed of faithful people; its visible expression is found in groups of them. Everything else is subsidiary. No matter how immediately the corollaries of such groups arise, these corollaries are not in themselves the *sine qua non*, without which a Church cannot be. Is a society of Quakers a Church? Of course, if they believe in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. They may have no officers, no preaching, no building; they may declare no creed, observe no ceremonies, and exercise no discipline; but they are Churches, nevertheless, just as much as were bodies of believers that met in house-churches in Ephesus or Rome in Apostolic days.

Of course it is natural that saved people should at once wish to join in praise and worship, that they should by outward and visible signs manifest their faith and love, that they should in time desire to say as exactly as they can what they believe, keep their fellowship pure and holy, and appoint officers for different functions. But all these things, important as they are, can only be secondary,

and it is the elementary and fundamental basis on which we must insist. Worship, creeds, officers, sacraments—none of these must occupy the first place. That belongs to the group of believers with Christ in the midst.

* * *

INCIDENTALLY it may be observed that Congregational Churches to-day almost entirely ignore one of the "true marks of a Church" that years ago they perhaps were inclined to over-emphasize. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these marks were stated again and again (repeatedly by John Knox, for example) to be :—

(1) The Word truly preached.
(2) The Sacraments purely administered.
(3) Discipline according to the Word of God.

How rarely is discipline of any kind exercised in our Churches? Is it ignored because the Church has thought out the matter and come to the considered opinion that wheat and tares shall grow together until the harvest, or because its exercise is so difficult and delicate? To quote words previously used :—

> Do we not make a mistake in allowing it to be supposed that "once a Church member, always a Church member," in not insisting that there is a minimum standard of life and conduct below which a member must not fall? How many of us have ever exercised *any* discipline in our Churches? How many have always shirked the difficult and delicate task of making plain that there are things that dishonour Christ's banner, and persons whose association with the Church brings dishonour upon His name? . . . If the world does not see a higher standard of life in those who belong to the Church, the Church's hope of impressing the world is gone for ever.

* * *

WOMEN are being asked to play a large part in the Forward Movement, and many of them are already hard at work; a considerable proportion of the £500,000 will be raised by Bazaars and Sales of Work that will call for much labour on their part. It should not be inopportune, therefore, to suggest that the sex to whose devotion and loyalty the Church owes so much should be more adequately represented in the executive work of individual Churches and of the denomination. A woman on a diaconate is still a novelty in some parts of the country, while nowhere is there representation in proportion to the number of women members. The Council of the Union has now fifteen lady members—a great increase on previous years, but still far too small, and less than one in twenty of the Council's membership. And has anyone yet dreamed of electing a woman to the Chair of the Union? Why not? But for women many of our Churches would speedily fade

away and die, and we should see to it that service carries representation and honour, and show that we believe that there is neither male nor female in Christ Jesus.

* * *

HISTORICAL study has rarely sustained such losses in one year as in the year 1922. Among other historians whom we shall miss are our own Dr. John Brown, Dr. Williston Walker of Yale, Sir George W. Prothero, and M. Ernest Lavisse, the historian *par excellence* of France, whose death coincided with the publication of the last volume (ix.) of the *Histoire de France Contemporaire.*

All of them in their own spheres had rendered conspicuous service to the cause of history. M. Lavisse had edited a gigantic work with conspicuous success, the story of France being told with characteristic French lucidity in a work of twenty-seven volumes. He regarded history in no narrow sense, but included within its range those intellectual and artistic pursuits which make up so much of life. Material things did not obsess him, neither was he so "impossible" in regard to idealistic policies as are many of his countrymen. The conclusion of the History (vol. ix. deals with the war) shows him to be a believer in the League of Nations, and he is not afraid to say :—

> Tous les peuples aiment à gagner de l'argent, la France comme les autres. Mais nous pouvons dire que ce n'est pas notre souci principal ; à côté de l'intérêt, nous faisons large place à des idées et à des sentiments.

In Sir George Prothero we had a fine type of the old English gentleman. Many remember him best as an efficient teacher in the University of London and as the heart and soul of the Royal Historical Society. Generally, however, he was thought of in the capacity of editor of the *Quarterly Review*, a journal which he kept on an astonishingly high level for many years, though his politics were anathema to many of us. There were no hesitations about Prothero's Conservatism ! In this connexion one of his last speeches may be recalled—a beautifully phrased, although apparently impromptu, tribute to Lord Bryce. Warm in his praise of Bryce as historian, diplomatist, climber, and man of letters, the speaker was careful to disassociate himself from Bryce's political views. We may say that Sir George was greatly interested in the establishment of our own Journal, and did not a little to help in the initial stages by his counsel and experience.

Dr. John Brown was beloved by all who knew him, whether as pastor or as friend. He lived to a happy old age, and even after deafness afflicted him was often to be seen in our gatherings. It is as the biographer of Bunyan that he will live (we do not hesitate to put his work among the first twelve biographies in our language),

though many ministers still find that his *Apostolic Succession* is by no means out of date, and Dr. Brown himself was delighted when two years ago he was told how eagerly young people were reading his *Pilgrim Fathers* and how well that work was standing the test of time.

Dr. Williston Walker had no small gifts as ecclesiastical statesman and administrator, but he was best known on this side of the Atlantic through his books. From 1893 until his death he was constantly producing works on different periods in the history of the Church, all of them marked by sound scholarship and wise judgment. His knowledge was extensive but accurate, and books like *John Calvin* and *The History of the Christian Church* show him at his best. For a more detailed account of Walker's writings and an impression of his personality we may perhaps refer readers to the notice appearing in the current issue of the *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*.

* * *

Since the above paragraph was written two other distinguished scholars have passed away in the persons of Dr. James Hastings and Dr. Buchanan Gray. No minister and no Church but is indebted to Dr. Hastings, whose untiring energy enabled him to perform tasks before which most men would shrink. If there has been a greater editor in the last generation, his name does not occur to us.

Dr. Buchanan Gray was one of ourselves, and to him the whole Church of Christ is debtor for his sound learning and acute judgment. Mansfield men and the Churches round Oxford have especial reason to give thanks for the inspiration and service of his life. Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Dr. Gray's colleague at Mansfield for so many years, writes an appreciation of his life on another page of this issue.

THE WORLD'S NEED OF PEACE

You have asked me to write a page on the greatest need of the world—Peace.

Peace is a victory over war, the only victory that leaves no bitter memories. It requires all the strength and determination of strong men, all the combativeness that war itself inspires. It is the greatest moral ideal in the world. It is the promise by which angels heralded the advent of the Christian era. But it still requires translation into practical politics, and must be worked out on an arithmetical basis. All progress starts by men seeing visions and transforming them into facts. After two thousand years of war between nation and nation the vision of Peace has been materialized into the machinery of Peace in the Covenant of the League of Nations. No antidote to war appears so simple, and yet none has proved so difficult of achievement as this great experiment. Nothing seems more reasonable and more attractive to the common sense of the peoples of the world than that disputes should be submitted to joint arbitration. Yet it is the very simplicity of a scheme which makes it difficult of achievement. An idea which is strange and unacceptable to the public opinion of the world may in the long run attract to itself more brilliant supporters and more widespread enthusiasm, with the result that its triumph is more speedy ; but the simpler the solution, the greater the apathy and the indifference.

The husbandman finds the best soil on the rim of a burnt-out volcano ; so the devastated area of Europe ought to be a rich site for the Garden of Peace. While the havoc, the conflagration and the squalor of war are fresh in the mind we must dig and trench, for, if we delay, another generation is arising which has not passed through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, which will forget the terrors of war, and be lured by all the tinsel of its romance. The men who have fought and suffered must build now with all the urgency they can command. This is the greatest contribution that any age can make to the history of humanity. If we delay now, the victory of Peace will be for ever deferred and civilization itself will be utterly overthrown.

D. Lloyd George.

THE "HOLY ALLIANCE" AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

THE old and discarded aphorism "that history repeats itself" had a certain value. It was an assertion that the history of the past had some meaning for the present: it was a groping after the idea of law in human affairs. We can see clearly enough now that history does not repeat itself; but we probably feel all the more strongly that history is "given for our learning," and that there are some periods which offer a close parallelism to our own, and are especially full of instruction whether in the way of warning or suggestion.

Such a period is that which followed the close of the Napoleonic struggle. That great war and our much greater war have a good deal of resemblance. Then, too, all Europe was ablaze: the non-combatant Powers were affected almost as much as the combatant. The United States were drawn into the struggle, though they did not then exercise any decisive influence. The British Navy influenced every battle and did much to decide the issue. Economic exhaustion contributed powerfully to the result. Lastly—and this is the point of most immediate application—from the beginning to the end of the war there was the hope that this might be a "war to end war," and in the final settlement there was a scheme for saving Europe from international anarchy, which is one of the forerunners of the present "League of Nations."

The aspiration towards universal peace had made itself audible from the first. Coleridge foresaw the day when "conquest would be abjured," and he "hung his head and wept at Britain's name," because she seemed to him a needlessly aggressive Power. The decision of the French Revolution to abstain from conquest was enshrined in the Constitution of 1791: "La nation française renonce à entreprendre aucune guerre dans la vue de faire des conquêtes et n'emploiera jamais ses forces contre la liberté d'aucun peuple." They are noble words, and their significance is not wholly taken away by the many wars of conquest that the French people were induced to undertake during the next twenty-four years. The war brought with it disillusionment, as wars always do. There were plenty to be found on both sides who said that it was only force that counted, and that the world was hindered rather then helped by the "ideologues." But the spectacle of Europe plunged for a quarter of a century into confusion continued to urge the more serious statesmen to see if the "way of peace" could not be found. When we read of a proposal to "form at the restoration of peace a general agreement

and guarantee for the mutual protection and security of different Powers and for re-establishing a general system of public law in Europe," it is a little difficult to realize that the date is 1804, not 1914, and that the pen belongs to the Czar Alexander, not to Mr. H. H. Asquith. Or read the following passage:—

"It seems necessary at the period of general pacification to form a treaty to which all the principal Powers of Europe should be parties, by which their respective rights and possessions shall be fixed and recognized. And they should all bind themselves mutually to protect and support each other against any attempt to infringe them. It should re-establish a general and comprehensive system of public law in Europe, and provide as far as possible for repressing future attempts to disturb the general tranquillity, and above all for restraining any projects of aggrandizement and ambition similar to those which have produced all the calamities inflicted on Europe."

Who is the author of this sober and solemn warning against the results of national individualism? Is it President Wilson, or M. Bourgeois, or Mr. Lloyd George? It is from the pen of William Pitt, whom no one calls an idealist.

These ideas were not without their effect on the statesmen who were responsible for the resettlement of Europe in the two Congresses of Vienna. Their chief work was indeed the drawing of frontier lines, the fixing of indemnities, the consideration of dynastic questions, and they were for the most part actuated by the ideas which are usually summed up as the "Balance of Power." They assumed, that is to say, as a thing self-evident, that states were natural enemies, that to be strong was to be dangerous, and that the aggressive Power of yesterday would be the aggressive Power of to-morrow. But they did also make an attempt to give to Europe a new organization and some approach to an organic life. They attempted this by two means, first by "the Holy Alliance"; secondly by the Quadruple, or, as it soon became, the Quintuple Alliance. The origin and history of both these efforts must be looked at a little more closely.

The phrase "Holy Alliance" is often loosely used to cover both the attempts made to secure a stable European order, and it is sometimes said that Canning's action at Verona broke up the Holy Alliance. This is, however, a misuse of terms. The Holy Alliance was, properly speaking, the Czar's project which he brought forward with confident enthusiasm in 1815. The story has often been told. It deserves much reflexion, perhaps especially from those readers for whom this review is intended. The Czar's character had already shown something of the instability which was to mark it still more clearly later on. He had fallen of late under the influence of the Baroness Krudener. With her he had endeavoured to read the riddles of the Book of the Revelation; he had passed long hours in Bible reading and in prayer. "Since he has come to Paris he has passed

a part of every evening with Madame de Krudener, an old fanatic," wrote Castlereagh to Liverpool. Is not this a problem for the new psychology or the old evangelicalism—to separate the good from the bad in all that? It is usual for historians to pour ridicule on the project as "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense" (Castlereagh's words), and to see in it a hypocritical attempt to crush liberty in the name of religion. If the ground had been better prepared, if there had been a readiness on the part of practical statesmen to guide its enthusiasm to good ends, it might perhaps have formed a part in the preamble of a first draft of the League of Nations. The text is given in an appendix to Mr. Alison Phillips's *Confederation of Europe*. It asks its signatories to declare that they have "acquired the intimate conviction of the necessity of settling the steps to be observed by the Powers in their reciprocal relations upon the sublime truths which the Holy Religion of our Saviour teaches." It declares that they will regard each other as fellow countrymen, and "regarding themselves towards their subjects and armies as fathers of families, will lead them to protect Religion, Peace and Justice." It declares that they consider themselves "as members of one and the same Christian nation, which has in reality no other sovereign than Him to whom alone power really belongs." It ends by asking all Powers who will agree to sign the covenant. The foundations of the New Jerusalem seemed to its enthusiastic authors well and truly laid.

The document from which I have quoted these extracts emanated only from the heads of three Powers—"their Majesties, the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Russia." Many of the other Powers added their signatures, but for different reasons it never received the signatures of the Pope—then a temporal Power—or of the Prince Regent, who represented the Crown of England. Castlereagh's criticisms of the document were unquestionably well founded. It was a pious aspiration—in spite of all that came afterwards an aspiration really pious. It might have become the prelude of some document of great importance, but it could never become such a document itself. English statesmen are perhaps too suspicious of general principles; but Castlereagh was right in urging that "the sublime truths of our Holy Religion" required analysis and definition before they could be of real influence upon the action of statesmen. The world is only just ready now for a sincere effort to think out and to act on principles that shall make for European and world unity and the recognition of Humanity as a real and controlling idea. We are beginning to realize that but for President Wilson's efforts, but for his sacrifice of health and position and power, there would have been no Covenant of the League of Nations. And even President Wilson could have done little if the ground had not been prepared by the hard thought and bold

propaganda of individuals and societies in England and elsewhere. Thus the Holy Alliance was still-born. I do not believe it had any influence on the events of the next decade, or that people suffered and liberty was stifled because the rulers of Europe declared that they would act according to the principles of the Christian religion.

There was no President Wilson in 1815, but there was Lord Castlereagh. He remains still an enigmatic figure in our history. Miss Martineau gives the traditional liberal view of his character in speaking of his death. Twice over she tells us that the news of his suicide "was hailed with clasped hands and streaming eyes by aliens in many a provincial town in England." She goes on: "This man was the screw by which England had riveted the chains of nations. The screw was drawn and the immovable despotism might now be overthrown." Again: "There was abundant reason for the rejoicing which spread through the country on the death of Lord Londonderry (i.e. Castlereagh), and the shout which rang through the abbey when his coffin was taken from the hearse was natural enough." There has been considerable reaction from this view of late as the result of research into the authentic documents of the time. It is admitted that his domestic policy was that of a Tory of the old type, frightened by the excesses of the French Revolution. He was neither a good orator nor a clear writer. But the authentic despatches which Professor Webster has published and commented on in the *Cambridge History of Foreign Policy* make us think highly of his judgment, courage and persistence, and make us recognize that his aims were higher and more humane than those of the other European diplomatists of his age. He cut down with wise prescience the indemnities that were demanded from France. Above all, by the Quadruple (soon to become the Quintuple) Alliance he endeavoured to give to Europe some sort of organization which should save it from a renewal of war. That part of the treaty which aimed at preventing aggression on the part of France in the near future does not particularly concern us here. It is Article 6 which was the new factor in European politics. It runs as follows:—

"To facilitate and to secure the execution of the present treaty and to consolidate the convictions which at the present so closely unite the Four Sovereigns for the happiness of the World the High Contracting Parties have agreed to renew their meetings at fixed periods, either under the immediate auspices of the Sovereigns themselves or by their respective Ministers, for the purpose of consulting upon their common interests and for the consideration of the measures which at each of these periods shall be considered the most salutary for the repose and prosperity of Nations, and for the maintenance of the Peace of Europe."

So Great Britain, Prussia, Austria, Russia were to hold periodic meetings to consider dangers threatening European peace, as they

arose or before they became urgent. In one point they were much better situated for their work of resettling Europe than were the diplomatists of 1918. France was very soon admitted to equal partnership with the other Powers. The Allies had been fighting not against France but against Napoleon (such had been their constant claim); when therefore Napoleon had been exiled and the legitimate King placed by the Allies on the throne of France, how was it possible to keep him out of the charmed circle of crowned heads? The five great Powers would meet together from time to time and smooth out any rough places in the surface of Europe. It was not possible that any resistance should be made to the five great military and naval Powers. The attempt "to govern Europe by conferences" opened then with good auspices, and it was an attempt inspired by aims that were far from base. . . .

Yet it failed rapidly and completely. And I have heard it said, "As it was with your Holy Alliance" (for so the Quintuple Alliance is wrongly called), "so it will be with the League of Nations. The child of illusion, cherished naturally during a period of intolerable stress, it had a sickly life of less than eight years, and then perished, unregretted, to let the national forces of Europe run their course and work their will. The League of Nations may last a little longer, or it may perish more quickly, but it will go its way on to the dust-heap with Castlereagh's scheme."

We will look in a moment at the immediate causes of the break-up of the Quintuple Alliance. But let us first note how little that Alliance resembled the League of Nations. It was an alliance of Governments, some of which had hardly any connexion with the nation. It was an exclusive alliance of five great Powers. It relied upon force to maintain its position and secure its aims. It paid not even the least lip-homage to the idea of arbitration; it did not invoke the authority of international law; it had no permanent organization, and, except on the occasion of the periodic conferences, can hardly be said to have existed. It did not even profess to care for the rights of minorities, for the protection of small Powers, or for any measure of social improvement. It was, indeed, very much more like the Supreme Council than like the League of Nations, and it would be a matter of interest to compare the fate of the congresses which have met from Versailles to Genoa with the meetings at Aix-la-Chapelle, Laibach, Troppau and Verona. That is, however, foreign to our immediate subject. It is enough to say that if the history of the Holy Alliance has warning for anyone, it is for the Supreme Council rather than for the League of Nations.

The Alliance came to an end because it was decided to use its organization and its force to suppress nationalist, liberal and constitutional movements in Europe. It is this policy which is at the back of all the abuse of the Holy Alliance; it is this which makes

Miss Martineau write as she does, in the passages above quoted, of the death of Lord Castlereagh; it is this which made Byron write his ferocious epigrams on Castlereagh. The success of the Alliance would have robbed Europe of much that is noblest and most hopeful in its modern life; but success was impossible, for the Alliance was pitting itself against "those great allies" of which Wordsworth speaks—"exaltations, agonies and man's unconquerable mind." The error, however, great as it was, was not merely due to the lust of power, still less to any ingrained cruelty in the minds of the crowned heads of Europe and their advisers. It was due to the memory of the French Revolution. There was a movement wholly domestic, professing the most admirable principles, talking of peace and humanity and the rights of the nation. It seemed to Metternich and the rest that those opinions had set the world aflame and had given Europe nearly a quarter of a century of war. They were out to maintain peace and a settled European order, and it seemed to them that their first business was to suppress these dangerous movements affecting the hearts and minds of men, whose consequences no one could calculate. Great Britain was still in the grip of reaction, and the great Reform Bill was some way off. But her life contained many of the features which the majority of the Alliance thought poisonous. Her Tories would seem Liberals in Vienna or Berlin, and revolutionaries in Moscow. So it was impossible for her to co-operate in the suppression of her own principles. The Alliance was largely the work of an English statesman, Castlereagh; its disruption came also from English hands, and the final blow was administered by Canning. Let us briefly survey the action of the Alliance during its short life.

The new system was at its best in its first Conference, which met at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. Words and questions came up then which, immensely magnified, are now filling the papers and occupying the attention of thinking men—reparations, the continued occupation of the territory of the late enemy, the inclusion of that enemy in the new system, the use of the new organization for humanitarian purposes. Mr. Alison Phillips has given us an interesting account of the procedure of the Conference in his *Confederation of Europe*, but his book was published in 1914. The War and the Peace, the formation of the League of Nations, its hopes and its difficulties, make the subject more vitally and urgently interesting than it was in 1914, and suggest parallels and comments which we shall doubtless find in the next volume of the *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*. The Czar Alexander was the most prominent figure at Aix-la-Chapelle. His idealism had not worn off. He was still "a good European." "My army as well as myself is at the disposal of Europe," he said; and again: "I seek the welfare of the world in peace." His mood was still one of religious exaltation, and he

brought forward a scheme which seems like a sketch, and a fairly elaborate one, of the League of Nations. Professor Phillips does not quote the whole of the Russian "confidential memoir," and it well deserves to be reprinted *in extenso*. It amounted to a proposal for the formation of a great General Alliance, which should consist of the signatories of the Treaty of Vienna, "having as its object the guarantee of the state and territorial possession and of sovereignty *ab antiquo*." This was regarded as a natural extension and development of the Holy Alliance. The Quadruple Alliance was still to exist, but it was to become an organic part of the general alliance, and was to be in effect its executive. The new system, it was maintained, would be favourable to both order and progress: for on the one hand it "would guarantee the security of Governments by putting the rights of nations under a guarantee analogous to that which protects individuals," and on the other hand "the Governments, being relieved from fear of revolutions, could offer to these peoples constitutions." How striking is the parallel with the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations, though, again, the Quadruple Alliance would be more like the Supreme Council than the League's executive.

The proposal demanded thoroughgoing and even suspicious criticism. The guarantee of sovereignty to existing Governments, the promise of relief from the fear of revolutions, were phrases which might easily have a sinister meaning. But, as I look back at it across the century that includes the Great War and the Peace, it seems to me to contain ideas too good for summary rejection. If institutions were to be rejected because of possible or even occasional probable misuse, we must resign ourselves to anarchy. If public opinion had demanded it, the Czar's proposal might have been amended so as to remove the danger to liberty and yet give Europe an experiment in organic life that might have been of priceless advantage to us. But public and parliamentary opinion was decidedly hostile to any such entanglement with European politics and feared the despotic intentions of the Great Powers. Castlereagh was still a dominating force. He was jealous for his Quadruple Alliance and its periodic congresses, and he had not the imagination that could be kindled by a great idea. So there came a plentiful douche of cold water.

"The problem of a Universal Alliance for the peace and happiness of the world has always been one of speculation and hope, but it has never yet been reduced to practice, and if an opinion may be hazarded from its difficulty, it never can." With greater wisdom he went on to say that if Governments were to be guaranteed against internal enemies, a necessary condition was "the previous establishment of such a system of general governments as may secure and enforce upon all kings and nations an internal system of peace and justice." In this polite phrase Castlereagh, the bloodthirsty

reactionary of the popular imagination, hints that Great Britain cannot lend a hand in upholding the Governments of Spain, or Naples, or Greece, or perhaps of Moscow. The Czar did not persist. His exalted enthusiasm was rather apt to be a fire of straw, and the chief results of the Conference were the withdrawal of the army of occupation from French soil and the admission of the restored French monarchy into the alliance, which thus became an Alliance of the five great military Powers of Europe. The document by which this admission was effected still speaks the old language, and its phrases were getting worn and rang a little false now. "The intimate union established among the monarchs offers to Europe the most sacred pledge of its future tranquillity." "The repose of the world will be constantly their motive and their end." "They solemnly acknowledge that their duties towards God and the people make it peremptory on them to give to the world an example of justice, of concord, and of moderation."

Such was the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. It is usually taken as an illustration of the solid common sense of British statesmen and the foolish enthusiasm of the Czar. It is at least possible that the Czar pointed the way not only to a higher but to a more practical goal than did Castlereagh. If sober sense and enthusiasm had entered into an alliance, the product might have been of infinite profit to Europe. Castlereagh and Wellington had their way; it was soon clear that Europe would profit little by it.

After Aix-la-Chapelle the Alliance had no happy days. On the one side, the Czar Alexander was losing something of his liberal enthusiasm, which had always been superficial and emotional. He was exasperated by the failure of his schemes in Poland and alarmed by political plots and assassinations. On the other hand, as the great war fell back into a distance of five years, there were constitutional movements, which to timorous eyes were revolutionary, in various directions, especially in Spain and in Naples. The Czar still cherished his idea of a General Alliance. He even enlarged it. In its new form it would embrace all the world, and be even more like the League of Nations that we know. But he received no encouragement at all in that direction, fell more and more under the influence of the Austrian Metternich, and counted henceforward, in spite of occasional liberal utterances, as a force making against nationalism and constitutionalism.

The next Conference was held in 1820 at Troppau, and soon adjourned to Laibach. It was concerned chiefly with the revolution in Naples, where the King had been compelled to grant a constitution of the Spanish type. Italy was almost in fact a part of Austria, and there was great fear of the flame of liberty spreading. The Czar and Metternich were the chief agents in securing this Conference. Great Britain and France were not represented by plenipotentiaries,

and the Conference was the first step, and a long one, to the rupture of the Alliance. First, Russia, Austria and Prussia drew up the famous "Protocol of Troppau," declaring that, where revolutions have overthrown established government, "if owing to such alterations immediate danger threatens other states, the Powers bind themselves by peaceful means, and if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty state into the bosom of the Great Alliance." But it was in vain that the signatories tried by all means to procure the accession of Great Britain. Castlereagh would not hear of an attempt "to reduce to an abstract rule of conduct possible cases of interference in the internal affairs of independent states." France supported Great Britain, though with a difference. No joint action was undertaken. The Alliance still nominally existed, but its vigour was fatally weakened.

The Conference, or as it is more usually called, the Congress of Verona, which met in October 1822, was the last effort at government by conference. It was called to deal chiefly with the conflict of revolution and reaction in Spain, and its consequences in the Spanish colonies of South America. Here then came the danger that Castlereagh had always feared and foreseen; the action of the Alliance was to be turned to the repression of a constitutional movement, in a state that did not belong to the Alliance, on the ground that such a movement would imperil the stability of absolutist Governments elsewhere. The Tory Government of England, in which Castlereagh and Wellington exercised the preponderating influence, could not co-operate, and resolved to protest.

Castlereagh's suicide came before the Conference met. It was formerly assumed that the "liberal" action of England at the Conference was due to the substitution of Canning's influence for Castlereagh's. But modern inquiry and the access to official documents proves that this was not so. The instructions that the Duke of Wellington took to Verona were those which Castlereagh himself had drawn up before his death. When Canning took over the conduct of the foreign policy of England, brilliancy in speech and writing was substituted for heaviness of manner and awkwardness of style; youthful daring took the place of a cautious temperament almost overburdened with experience. But the policy of Great Britain was not materially altered. Quite definitely she refused to co-operate with the other Powers in the repression of Spanish liberalism. The action of Great Britain was not unexpected, and produced no international crisis. But Wellington's firm and unequivocal refusal marked the end of the experiment of organizing Europe through periodic conferences. The higher dreams of the Czar had never passed out of the land of dreams into reality. Now the limited and more practical scheme of Castlereagh was at an end, after a short and never prosperous career. In Great Britain

there was nothing but relief. Liberal opinion re-echoed Byron's savage epigram on Castlereagh.

> So he has cut his throat at last! He! Who?
> The man who cut his country's long ago.

And among the Tories there was a large body of supporters who agreed with Canning when he wrote: "The issue of Verona has split the one and indivisible Alliance into three parts. . . . So things are getting back to a wholesome state again. Every nation for itself and God for us all."

Such were the events whose centenary comes this year (1922). The idea of a European order was abandoned. It did not figure henceforth in the speeches or writings of statesmen; it was to be found only in the utterances of poets, mystics or cranks. The world for the next century was dominated by the ideas of democracy, nationality and the Balance of Power. Democracy was the development or adaptation of an old idea. Nationality was far from new. The Balance of Power was as old as the hills or the heart of man. It was not, as has been supposed, something wicked; it was the inevitable relation of fully developed states, conscious of their individuality, recognizing their own advantage as their proper goal, and refusing to accept any higher authority, whether law, court of arbitration, or international council. Many declared or hoped that the combined forces of democracy and nationality would suffice to maintain international harmony. No one will maintain it now. At no period of history were democratic principles so generally accepted as in 1914. At no time was the sentiment or illusion of nationality so overwhelmingly strong. It is not necessary to recall what the Great War was; what heroism it showed, what courage, what amazing power of invention, persistence and organization; and on the other hand what hate it engendered, what lies it loved, what unparalleled hecatombs of dead it claimed, what blows, almost fatal, it inflicted on morality, religion, idealism and on the very ideas of justice and humanity. We only now begin to realize the depth of the abyss into which we were thrust by the difficulty we find in crawling out of it.

As during the Napoleonic struggle, so during the Great War, the hope arose that this might be the last of the wars. No one gave utterance to this hope with the lyrical fervour of Wordsworth or Coleridge or Shelley; but in all countries, and especially in America and in England, groups of men met together, exchanged ideas and elaborated a plan for the international organization of the world. I do not know how much they considered the history of the Holy Alliance and the Quadruple Alliance; but from the beginning their schemes were far more definite than the first, and far more extensive than the second. It was preached at first too much as a talisman which had

only to be adopted to introduce peace with all its blessings into Europe and the world. When it turned out that the terrific ground-swell, which was left by the Great War, was too violent to be assuaged by any form of words, a natural reaction followed. Enthusiasm gave way to cynicism in many quarters. Because it had not accomplished all that was hoped, it was assumed that it had done nothing, and that it was incapable of doing anything. There are important sections of English opinion where it seems that there is a desire to revert to the old system of unrelated states, with their almost insane egoistic absorption, their partial alliances, their balance of power and the wars which are the inevitable result of such a condition of international relationships. There is no need here to speak of the League of Nations, the organization, methods, or aims. I will end by making a few comments on it in the light of the subject that I have been trying to deal with in this paper.

The Great Alliance perished through the attempt to use it to suppress liberal and constitutional movements. That is a danger from which the League is free. There is a great contrast between the prevailing temper at the end of the Napoleonic wars and that which dominated Europe in 1918. In 1815 it was assumed by most of the spokesmen of the nations that democracy was the greatest of evils. Europe must be saved from it; its consequences had been shown in the Reign of Terror and in the wars that followed. In 1918 all the world seemed republican. Such monarchies as remained had to be explained away. The world, it was hoped, had been made safe for democracy. Some held that no country should be admitted to the League which had not adopted a constitution of a democratic kind. Our danger probably lies the other way. We are perhaps too much under the power of the shibboleths of democracy, and assume too readily that everything is a democracy that calls itself so and that all Governments that do not rest on representation are tyrannies. But in any case the lesson of the Holy Alliance has been learnt. The League of Nations may fail, but it is not likely that it will fail through an attempt to interfere with the internal affairs of the different nations.

I think that this chapter of history may teach us more lessons than that. We see now what really underlay Canning's words—"Every state for itself and God for us all." It meant the consecration of national egotism; it meant rival alliances, the Balance of Power, the Great War. Is there any force in the twentieth century which the nineteenth century did not know, to which we may trust to avoid those consequences? I can see none. It seems to me clear that the solidarity of labour is not a more reliable or a stronger force than the solidarity of democracies was in the nineteenth century. The need of peace is not more evident; the spontaneous effort to avoid war is not stronger. There are now, as

there were then, forces making for war and forces making for peace. The pacific forces are, I believe, deeper, stronger, more permanent; but unless they are organized and entrenched within a constitution they will be swept away, as so often before, by the superficial but extremely mobile passions of men.

A hundred years ago the slight and carelessly organized plan for giving Europe an organic life was swept away. It is worth noting that it was not taken up again. International organization is a matter of enormous difficulty. It took twenty-five years of war to induce Europe to move in 1815. It took the deaths of eight millions of men to get the Covenant of the League of Nations on the Treaty of Versailles. Some say that the League is so faulty that it would be best to scrap it and start again. If it is scrapped I am convinced we shall want another war—greater and more devastating—to make us start again. It seems to me now that it would have been well to have maintained the Holy Alliance, to have maintained the Quintuple Alliance, and to have steadily striven to read into them new meanings and to turn them to wiser ends. And it is to me a matter of certainty that it would be madness in statesmen to turn from the present League because of any defects in organization or doubtful aims among some of its members.

My last reflexion is that it is sometimes easier to do a great thing than a small thing. We have heard during the recent meeting at Geneva Lord Robert Cecil adopt the maxim of the great French revolutionist and exhort his hearers to "courage, courage, and ever more courage." Would not the Czar Alexander's scheme in wise hands have had a greater chance of success than the sober plan of Castlereagh? Burke wrote in 1775, when a crisis far less than ours faced England and the world: "If we are conscious of our station and glow with zeal to fill our places as becomes our situation and ourselves, we ought to auspicate all our public proceedings with the old warning of the Church, *Sursum corda!* We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of the trust to which the order of Providence has called us." And despite all dangers and all grounds for discouragement we should let our imagination play freely on the immense possibilities of the present hour. Both pessimism and optimism are forms of intellectual lethargy. It is our duty to balance the good with the evil and throw ourselves resolutely on the side of the good. Our opponents are neither few nor feeble. I will not attempt to analyse them. But on our side we have in overwhelming majority the Churches, the Women, and the Labour Organizations of the country. Confident in this great alliance we may well "lift up our hearts" to meet the uncertain future.

A. J. Grant.

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY

It seems only right that Congregationalists should gain through their own Quarterly, in the birth of which he much rejoiced,[1] some impression of one of the greatest sons of modern Congregationalism. Dr. Gray's gifts revealed themselves largely, though not wholly, in ways and in a sphere which lie off the main tracks of average life. Yet it was a very strenuous and fruitful, if outwardly uneventful, career that reached its earthly close, in full harness, on November 2nd, at a meeting of the Board of Theology in Oxford. And so, as his colleague for nearly thirty years, I essay the task of making him better known by those whom he strove to serve very really, if for the most part indirectly.

George Buchanan Gray was a son of the Congregational manse, and was born on January 13th, 1865. He received much of his school education from his father, the Rev. Benjamin Gray, B.A., an *alumnus* of New College, Hampstead, whose life-long pastorate was at Blandford, in Dorset. After a period of self-education, while engaged in school tuition (at Faringdon, in Berkshire, and at Blackheath), during which he prepared for his B.A. at London, the son entered his father's old college as a candidate for the ministry in 1886. Before his course there was finished, his aptitude for Hebrew had so impressed his teacher, Professor Evans, that he encouraged his pupil to seek fuller opportunities for its cultivation at Oxford, where Dr. Driver was then the leading English Hebraist. Such a step was the easier in that Mansfield College had for two years been in existence under Dr. Fairbairn; and to it accordingly Gray transferred, in the autumn of 1888, for special study in Hebrew and cognate languages, securing in 1891 a First Class in the School of Semitic Studies. Between 1889 and 1893 he won the three University scholarships for Hebrew, as well as the Junior Septuagint Prize. The essay which secured for him the Senior Kennicott Scholarship in 1893 formed the basis of his first published work (1896), *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*.

Already he possessed the basis of a thorough and exact Semitic scholarship, such as Drs. Driver and Cheyne in Hebrew, Dr. A. Neubauer in Rabbinic learning, and Professor Margoliouth in Arabic and Syriac, were so well able to impart to any gifted pupil. But on it Gray continued to build, by the aid of others and by original research of his own, to the very end. Besides Hebrew, his special language was Arabic, which also he studied for a semester under

[1] Reviews from Dr. Gray's pen, which were among his latest tasks, will be found on another page.—Ed.

Wellhausen in Marburg. Later on he added some practical knowledge of colloquial Arabic during a visit to the Holy Land. This visit also added greatly to his realization of the human background of the Old Testament, both land and people, with its Semitic psychology and customs. In other ways, too, he went on enlarging the range of his knowledge as an Orientalist, being alive to the value of the comparative method in the study of Old Testament literature. Thus he was able to make use of Babylonian and Assyrian materials, in particular, for the illustration and elucidation of Hebrew history and religion. All this breadth of outlook contributed not a little to the soundness and security of his judgments in his more special sphere. The estimate formed of his scholarship was indicated years ago by the D.Litt. degree of Oxford and the Hon. D.D. from Aberdeen. But the standing he came to enjoy as a Hebraist may best be judged from the fact that not only did he contribute two volumes of his own (*Numbers*, 1903, *Isaiah i.–xxxii.*, 1911) to the International Critical Commentary, the standard work of its order, but he was requested by Dr. Driver, when on his death-bed, to complete and edit his commentary on *Job* in that series. To these major works, involving immense labour and detail, must be added his *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament* (in Duckworth's *Studies in Theology*, 1913), *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (1915)—probably the most scientific discussion of the subject in English—and many scattered articles, some of them important and elaborate (e.g. that in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* on " Place-Names in Hebrew ").

This output is striking, less in its amount—though it is really large for one side of a life of many activities—than in its quality. It was uniformly exact and of lasting value from the first stage to the last. There had fallen on him by natural affinity the mantle of his special master, Driver, who was eminent for conscientious accuracy of detail, fairness of judgment and caution in inference. But to this Gray added more enterprise of constructive effort, especially in historical and theological interpretation ; and this fact leads naturally to some estimate of him as one devoted not only to " sound learning," but to " true religion," both in theory and in practice.

The proportion of his work dealing with the technical side of O.T. scholarship in a period of great and rapid growth in its materials, and the problems raised by these, was necessarily large ; but all was subordinate in Gray's mind and interest to the great central and abiding questions of O.T. religion, and of that as the preparation for the crowning revelation of God to man in Jesus the Christ, and hence needful to a sure and full understanding of the N.T. Of this consciousness he early gave tokens in addresses delivered to non-academic audiences, with a view to share as widely as possible the gains of the newer and more accurate study of the Bible, approached in the first instance historically, that is, in the order and manner

in which its messages were originally given. Such popularization lay near his heart, and to it he returned again and again. His first published address of this sort was on "The Divine Discipline of Israel," read before the Congregational Union at Leicester, October 1896. In it he brings out with rare lucidity the intimate connexion between the development through the Hebrew Prophets of the idea of God, that special treasure committed to Israel, and a progressively true morality, the two together forming "spiritual" religion, as the Bible has taught both Jews and Christians to conceive it. In this address the idea of God occupied the central place: the other aspect, the moral ideal, out of which as soil it grew and which it deepened and heightened and purified—especially through a growing conception of moral personality in the individual—was unfolded in "The Growth of Moral Ideas in the Old Testament" (three lectures to the Friends' Summer School of Theology at Birmingham in September 1899). As one reads these summaries [1] of the religious findings of the newer methods of Biblical study, rather misleadingly known as the Higher Criticism (i.e. the accurate historical study of the *substance* of the Bible, as distinct from and "higher" than the textual or "lower" study of its letter or *form*), one is astonished at the maturity of judgment and religious insight already possessed by their author. They still hold good, in their main lines, after a quarter of a century of intense and testing research, and are, so far as I know, unsurpassed in their own order and scale. Unhappily, Gray's college lectures on O.T. Religion and Theology have not assumed printed form: they live only in the mind and pulpit ministry of successive generations of his students. But he had occasion, as President of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology for this year, to return to his first and abiding theme, in an inaugural address on "Hebrew Monotheism." This, alas! the touch of sudden death, on the very eve of its delivery, prevented him from uttering with his own voice and characteristic gesture of conviction. Through it, however, when printed in the private Proceedings of the Society (and possibly, later, in a form accessible to all), he, "though dead," will "yet speak" his last testimony on what he had found in the O.T. touching the greatest theme of all, the nature of God.

But, after all, Gray never put on paper any adequate reflexion of his full religious faith. That was embodied only in the sum total of what he was and did, his character and his many-sided activities. Of the latter no complete account can even be suggested. To his home life and piety, though in it lay, with him as with most men, the secret springs of much of the best and deepest in all the other circles of his influence, one can only allude with silent

[1] Both the address and the lectures are published under the single title *The Divine Discipline of Israel* (A. & C. Black, 1900, and later), and form his most precious legacy to Christian men and women at large.

reverence. But of those other circles one may say without reserve, that in them he adorned the name of "Christian" no less than that of "scholar." English, through and through, in his whole habit of mind, he was instinctively reserved in the expression of his religious faith and emotion. But none who knew him more than slightly could doubt the intensity as well as the reality of his devotion to God, "the living God," active in the souls of men, particularly through the Jesus of history and the Lord of Christian experience. Whether one should ask those who sat with him on University Boards of Study, or examined with him at Oxford or for other Universities, and learned to count on his sound and clear-thinking counsel; or his fellow-members on the Council of Bishop's Stortford College or of Mansfield House Settlement, Canning Town; or the people who met him at the Settlement; or members of the County Union and of its Committee, on which he sat year after year, becoming President in 1913, and delivering an impressive address, full of the best Independent ideals—of which, whether religious or civil,[1] he was throughout a living witness in all companies; or members of George Street Congregational Church, Oxford; or, finally and chiefly, those who knew him within the loved precincts of Mansfield College, as fellow-student, colleague, teacher, and most of all at the Wednesday evening corporate service in chapel—one and all, according to the degree of insight which circumstances admitted, would agree that Gray was a man who lived "as in the Great Taskmaster's eye," taking all life's duties seriously, as well as joyously, and discharging them with an exacting conscience. But we who lived nearest to him, some of us for long years on end, knew more than this. We knew him as the friend and good comrade in the whole range of life, its lighter as well as its graver moods, its humour no less than its pathos. For he was the most human of scholars, and in all and through all he lived not only "as seeing Him that is invisible," but also as face to face with Him who is "the image of the invisible God," His Son in human nature: and this progressively so.

There lay the chief inspiration of his life and example: it was a constantly growing and deepening thing, that ultimate mystery, that *Shekinah* of God, a human personality becoming more receptive of the Divine. "The Glory of God," says Westcott, "is a living man"; and Gray was "a living man" in a far diviner sense and fullness at the end of his career at Oxford than when he entered it. His whole nature had become spiritualized, its native and merely instinctive qualities transmuted, or in manifest process of being so, by an inward power that was not of earth or time. A larger, kindlier, and more patient charity was superadded to the passion

[1] Reference to his sturdy Liberalism, of the Radical type, with special sympathy for Labour's interests, though not always for its "Socialist" plans for realizing them, must not be omitted from the picture, if it is to be a full-length one.

for righteousness which distinguished him from the first, as the redemptive attitude and method of God, involved in "the grace of Christ," grew upon him. God, and His long-suffering, meant, I fancy, more and more to him practically, as he became more conscious of direct or mystical fellowship with the Divine as active in his own soul.

"We are all born," it has been said, "Aristotelians or Platonists," inclined to apprehend reality by induction from particulars to principles, or on the other hand as principles, perceived more instinctively, and only partially or tardily submitted to revision by observation of concrete things or facts. Gray was born an Aristotelian: he had a wholesome reverence for definite facts and a suspicion of easy generalities or philosophizings. Yet he himself exhibited much philosophic ability in the generalizations which he felt warranted in venturing. Thus ere he died he was both Aristotelian and Platonist in temper, a man with an all-round development of his mental life and sympathies. I think it was the sense that Gray had with the process of the years become a larger, deeper, nobler man, both mentally and spiritually, as well as a greater scholar, that made most old Mansfield men rejoice and give God thanks in his behalf, at the Old Men's reunions and at other times.

This surely is the greatest thing a man can achieve in life, whether as scholar or as layman in "sacred learning," to leave such an impression of progress in character and outlook, through faith in God, as makes the phrase "a man of God" a triumphant fact. It was because George Buchanan Gray had so lived, as well as won a world-wide name as a scholar, that we who were present at his Memorial Service, if only in spirit, mourned as those who had also an immortal hope, confirmed even in the face of death.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE MEANING OF THE DEATH OF JESUS

For the past half-century the mind of the Church has been much exercised by the problem of the Atonement. The extremely mechanical nature of the older theories, with their pedantic categories for God and Christ and man, offended both the moral sense of many Christians and their consciousness of God as Jesus has revealed Him. There has arisen in our time an intense and widespread feeling of revolt against such ideas as the innocent suffering instead of the guilty, a substitute being punished in the sinner's place, and a redemption entirely independent of the soul's co-operation. For many the truth of God's love has become such an axiom that the need for atonement is obscured.

The answer of Christian theology to these and other difficulties has been anything but plain. The preaching of the Cross is not crystal-clear in the modern pulpit. We have yet to make our re-statement in modern categories of the great Truth that glimmers through all theories of the Atonement. Meanwhile there is loss of power. If an army has lost the meaning of its banner, how can it march to victory? For good or ill, the Cross is the supreme symbol of our faith, and the Church simply must re-discover its essential meaning and make it clear to the world.

The New Testament gives a supreme place to the death of Jesus. The greatest fact about Him, according to the apostles, is that He died. Perfect as was His life, dominant and divine as was His person, it was nevertheless His death which focussed the power of these things upon the souls of His disciples with irresistible force.

"The love of Christ constraineth us because . . . one died for all."

George Bernard Shaw in a rash moment once committed himself to the opinion that the influence of Jesus would have been just as great if He "had enjoyed an income of £5,000 a year and had died naturally in his bed." Even Homer nods! We can say with perfect confidence that if such had been the circumstances, Jesus would have been about as well known and as influential as Plato, Socrates, Philo or Hillel to-day. This means that we need regard the death of Jesus, not as *absolutely* necessary to the redemption of the world, but simply as *relatively* necessary, the state of humanity being what it was. From one aspect the death of Jesus was a foul and brutal crime, a miscarriage of justice, a sordid murder that the world might well have been spared. If the Jews had accepted instead of murdering their true Messiah, we might never have had the Cross, but instead an ideally organized order of society—a visible Kingdom

of God winning ever wider and wider sway. But humanity did not make that choice. Instead, it "murdered the Prince of Life," and in surrendering to that "murder" Jesus invested the "crime" with strange redeeming efficacy. As one writer has said: "All through subsequent history the Cross has carried His meaning, not theirs."

It was because the apostles saw "His meaning" that He became to them more than a beautiful Divine Teacher. He became the Purchaser of their souls, the Saviour from sin's far-reaching corruption, the Deliverer from a past graven into the very texture of the soul and of the universe. It was this fact which, above and beyond every other consideration, inspired them with ceaseless devotion and a consuming gratitude.

Were they unreasonable in their conviction? "Because we thus judge," says St. Paul. Can we share their judgment? Let us see. We will take one step at a time.

There are at least two perfectly obvious ways in which it is true to say that Jesus died for me, for you.

The death of Jesus has been historically the source of immense blessing to every living soul. Think of the vast cruelties that the influence of Jesus has ended, from the gladiatorial combats of Imperial Rome and its gross infanticide to the emancipation of the slaves. It was the spirit of Jesus as evinced supremely at Calvary that laid the foundation of medical science, that built our hospitals and orphanages, that inspired our best educational ideals, that flung the grateful shade of the Red Cross over the pitiless field of battle, that tempered the harshness of life and of human behaviour in a thousand ways among nearly every race under the sun.

Though we may never kiss the piercéd hand that blessed us, we are nevertheless His bond-slave by a myriad blessings borne into our life by the stream of self-sacrifice which arose from His Cross.

A closer analysis might reveal still greater personal obligation. Think of such phrases as being "washed in the blood of the Lamb" and "His blood cleanseth us from all sin." We are very squeamish these days about terms of this kind, and indeed they have been in the past literalized to a repulsive degree. Suppose, however, that one is the subject, all unknowingly, of such an operation. Look up your pedigree—like everyone else, you will not go far without finding some story of shame and sin. Few genealogies are without, for example, the conventional drunkards of a generation or two ago. The power of atavism—the tendency to revert morally to one's ancestry—is to-day common knowledge. Yet these tastes, these "taints of blood, defects of will," have not reached you, they do not curse your life as they curse some. Why? Look again and you will find that in one life or another the blood-stream of your life was cleansed. It was cleansed, maybe, at the cost of fearful moral

effort, passionate self-denial, a crucifixion of the soul. And the inspiration which made that struggle possible, whence came it? Here is its source :—

"The life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

Some man, some woman in your line of descent felt the cleansing power of the pure spirit of Jesus. That "Strange Man upon His Cross" bore a certain sin right out of that life, and *out of yours.*

If, then, in the humanity of our day there exists a greater and more effective conscience against evil, if a new tenderness has been breathed into society, and we benefit thereby as we cannot fail to do, we cannot evade our debt to the crucified Christ.

The second quite obvious way in which the death of Jesus has undeniable reference to our personal selves is in the actual intention of Jesus. Whilst we must believe that the Cross was God's adaptation of Love's appeal to a world that rejected Him, yet we must not imagine that the tragic alternative was simply forced upon Jesus. There has been no more mischievous travesty of the truth than the teaching, direct or implied, that in the Cross God and Christ were opposed—the one as punisher and the other as punished. The whole meaning of Gethsemane is that Jesus then embraced wholeheartedly this other way, which up to the very last He and His Father hoped might not be necessary. The apostles are insistent upon this unity of purpose. "God commendeth His love towards us that while we were yet sinners Christ died for the ungodly." "He gave us His Son." All through the gospel narrative we can see Jesus becoming more and more convinced that this only other way would have to be taken. The redemptive purpose of God had been ready, "from before the foundation of the world," for all sacrifices that its triumph might demand. This is the sense in which the Cross was in the "determinate foreknowledge of God," but only gradually in the experience of Jesus did the possibility of the Cross, dimly felt from the beginning, become a certainty. As we study Christ's view of His own Cross, we see Him using the ideas and even the language of Isa. liii. His death is to be "a ransom for the multitude." "I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Myself." In saying after saying He shows us that "the world" is plainly His objective. He faces the Cross with the hope of thereby saving every human soul—yours and mine. He bore in Gethsemane, with sweat of blood, the horror of a world's sin and shame—nothing less than that could have brought such fear upon His otherwise dauntless spirit. He refused the cup of drugged wine that with every sense alert He might feel the painful cost of a sacrifice *intended by Him* to be to every sinning soul the proof of a deathless redeeming love.

At the moment one need not consider whether He was right or

wrong in seeing this value in His sacrifice. It is enough to bow in awed reverence before a love for humanity so absolute, so complete, so Divine—enough to see how simply true it is that He, this peerless One, died for me! In His belief, who was so exquisitely right in all else, His Cross would at some point, in some way, intervene between me and my sins. It is enough that Jesus thought this for me to pause before I say glibly that it cannot be. The pure intention of His soul wins at least my reverent consideration of the possibility. It is good, in a world like this, to be loved like that. There is a virtue in it that the hardest cynic cannot but feel. There was once a Man who loved all other men and for their sake, *to save them from their sins*, "endured the cross, despising the shame." He did not die like Socrates, giving men scorn for scorn; nor like Stephen, nor Edith Cavell, with a Christ to inspire Him; nor like heroes of war, drunk with "the fierce joy of battle." He died hemmed in by sin on every hand, betrayed by His followers, forsaken by all, cursed by the religious, sold by the guardians of justice, foresworn by the multitude, yet dying of set intent *for their sins and mine* in a passion of purest love, pleading even out of the heart of His agony, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!" There is no parallel to this in human history, and all the best that is like it draws its virtue from this fountain-head.

During the war it was the writer's privilege to see very much of a war hospital. On one occasion a corporal showed him the photograph of a man, taking it from under his pillow and handling it with reverence and love. The minister thought it might be the photo of a brother lost in the war, but as the corporal put it into his hands, he said, with a break in his voice and with eyes shining: "That's the man who saved my life, sir, and he nearly lost his own in doing it." Then followed a story common enough in the war, but there could be no doubt of the bond of everlasting gratitude established between those men. The figure of Jesus towers above our human world as that of One who has established just that bond between Himself and every soul. Men cannot deny that in Him there was a love which sought, for their sakes, to be stronger than death and sin.

But the Christian community has always felt that in the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ there was a deeper and more far-reaching significance than we have so far discovered. There is not one of us but would feel disappointed, such contrary mortals are even the most rationalistic, were we to stop here. Why? What more do we want? There is the key to the whole matter. *We all do want something more.* There is in every one of us the demand for atonement.

That word has a double significance. It stands in the New Testament for its ultimate meaning of at-one-ment or reconciliation—the eventual harmony of God and man. But by a deep undeniable

instinct—the instinct for justice—it stands in the human soul for compensation, for the atonement or making-up that must be made before reconciliation can be perfect. It is best to regard this, not so much as a demand of God upon man, as a demand on man's part. However freely God may forgive, this instinct for balance in man tells him that wrong must be righted, that the bitter loss occasioned by sin must be made good—by someone, and *he cannot accept, cannot rest in, God's mercy till he knows that this will happen.* Here is the true necessity for atonement. It is a great hungry cry from humanity —and it is there because it is in God. It is that sense of Love's Perfect Equality that we call Justice—for true justice is not opposed to Love, but is simply its refusal to be partial—its determination to include all and exclude none.[1] This is the answer to those who would deny the necessity of atonement because God is Love. Unconsciously they are using love in that argument in its purely *personal* reference to the individual sinner, forgetting that the sinner is part of a *society, every member of which is also and equally the object of Divine Love.* Now, if sin were purely a personal insult to God, one can well imagine that, like Jesus, He would readily and easily forgive it. "Against Thee and Thee only have I sinned" is an Old Testament conception of sin rendered obsolete by Jesus. But sin is more than a personal insult to God—*it is a blow at His other children.* That is another matter. Try it in your family. Jack takes Mary's doll and smashes its head. That is an insult to you, for you have made your will to him quite plain, that he is to be kind to his sister. If you take it merely like that, however, there will be trouble. You pat Jack on the head and you say, as he apologizes: "That's all right, little man, run away and play." But somebody else is waiting outside the door—Mary and her broken doll and—her mother! Now, what about it? Compensation! atonement! a loss to be faced and filled up! sacrifice!—and, if you're wise, a sacrifice in which Jack joins. His pocket-money will not reach to it! *Well, you add your resources to his.* You don't substitute yours for his. But atonement on his part without you would have been utterly impossible.

Yes, it is a perfect parable, Christianity is indeed a domestic religion.

We all make this demand for atonement. Reparation has become a very familiar word to us, and it is the character of sin that causes that demand. Sin is frightful loss to humanity, and in that loss no human soul can acquiesce without gross treachery to his kind and himself. It is a mistake to imagine that the religious and

[1] In this truth of the Absolute Equality of the Love of God, demonstrated nowhere so sublimely as in the Cross of Jesus, there are invaluable social implications, and a dynamic of social equity which the Church has yet to discover and use. Space forbids their elaboration in this article.

scientific views of sin are at variance. They simply present the matter from different points of view. Science deals with the past—it investigates facts, and observes what has been and is. Hence, seeing the distance man has travelled it is lost in admiration of man's progress, and his failure and transgression seem small in comparison. This is why a modern authority can say: "The higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins." You see at once the scientific view-point—"the higher man." The scientist is looking into the abyss from which man has emerged. But religion looks essentially to the future. It is the science of what ought to be. It looks up to God and the man-that-is-to-be, and inevitably its language is "God be merciful to me a sinner." The two view-points are perfectly reconcilable if one takes the complete vision into account. It is as though a man were climbing a cliff to escape for his life from the hungry sea. He looks down and says cheerfully to himself: "Oh! splendid! how well I've done. I'm safe enough." And then he looks up and sees to his dismay how far he has yet to go before he can be really safe, and he cries: "Woe is me: for I am undone." Science says: "It is wonderful that a beast should be as pure and moral as man." Religion says: "It is shameful that a man should not be as pure and good as God." Both statements are true, but it is the second that is the advance truth—the truth for progress.

We need a new consciousness of the terrible complications that sin causes. It lies at the root of the greater part of human sorrow. Man's struggle with Nature, with problems of social organization, with disease, would have just enough risk in it to impart zest and adventure to life—if it were not for sin. And in every heart there lies a fierce demand that somehow the gaping rents that sin makes in the fabric of human happiness and health, in the very fabric indeed of the universe—for the moral law is the world's true structure—shall be mended, that loss shall be made good, that wrong shall be righted, that atonement shall be made.

Now, of whom can this demand be made? We are all both far more *sinning* and *sinned against* than we care to realize. Our sins of commission may not be extensive, but our sins of omission are horrifying. Who dare claim that he is the man he might have been? Who dare measure our awful collective lethargy before great public wrongs and evils?

To take up the task of remedying for ourselves the sins of which we are personally guilty is very desirable and necessary, but it is not by any means easy of achievement, and in any case it but tinkers with a problem which involves every human soul—the whole race—in its consequence. The man who says "I want no Saviour—I can bear my own sins," is surely blind to obvious facts. He cannot bear his sin himself. Like the ripple in the pond, his sin eddies out to the furthest shore of human life. It travels down the years,

befouling innocent souls to distant generations. Nay more, in that it injures immortal souls must not its awful consequences reach beyond death? "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"

When, therefore, One appears in history bearing the credentials of a perfect moral victory—speaking as never man spake, exquisitely right in all spiritual matters, proclaiming God's mercy upon sinners, not merely in word but in a passionate universal love without parallel for purity and impartiality, offering Himself in torture and death in His travail to redeem us all, saying in effect, "I am the Atonement," even as He said "I am the Truth," and in the spell of that sacrifice drawing men after Him into a new way of life—is it too much to say: "He meets this fundamental hunger of our souls for atonement too perfectly for us to believe Him mistaken? We will believe Him right!"

If only we could take His love thus proved at Calvary as the absolute assurance to our guilty souls that God lifts from us the crushing weight of an unbearable responsibility for sin and pledges Himself to us for atonement of every wrong done by us and to us, what ineffable peace, what rapture of freedom would be ours! This is the meaning of the death of Jesus. This is the Christian salvation, this deliverance from the horror of a guilt one is powerless to redeem without God, from a tyranny of the past which is incarnate in our present selves and beyond us in the souls of others, from the bondage of sin in ourselves and in the race.

If at present we cannot go beyond this, if we cannot yet trace with perfect psychology the entire mystery of how the sacrifice of Christ in death reaches out to defeat sin in the universe that lies beyond our earthly life, and whither, alas! our own personal sin has travelled in its far-reaching consequences, need we refuse on that account this meaning of His death for ourselves here and now?

If Divine Love has stooped in Christ to lift our burden, shall we not let it go and turn joyfully in our new-won freedom to make His righteousness ours as devotedly as He has made our sin to be His?

Whether our relation to the Cross be orthodox or not, satisfying the formulæ of old theories matters little. Is our relation to Christ's sacrifice real? Does it bring the leverage of His love to bear powerfully upon our lives? These are the essential questions. Do we, in this sign, conquer?

A. D. Belden.

THE JESUS OF HISTORY AND THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

It was high time for a new book in English dealing in a comprehensive way with the literary and historical problems presented by the Acts of the Apostles. An immense amount of work has recently been done, in various departments of scholarship, which from one angle or another impinges upon the problems of the Acts, regarded as the classical account of the first stages of Christian History. The meticulous and successful analysis applied to the Synoptic Gospels has both supplied results of significance for the criticism of the book and sharpened our critical instruments for use upon its text. The comparative study of religious movements in the world within which Christianity made its appearance—both in Jewish and in Greek circles—has put fresh material at our disposal and challenged us to relate it to the history of early Christianity. We owe thanks therefore to Harvard University for setting on foot the very ambitious series of volumes now appearing under the title *The Beginnings of Christianity*.[1] Part I. of this work is to contain an edition on the grand scale of the Acts of the Apostles, and the two volumes which have so far appeared are in the way of Prolegomena and Critical Introduction to this edition. The field covered is very wide, perhaps unnecessarily wide, and while the assignment of various topics to separate authors, specialists in their own departments, has certain obvious advantages, there is a lack of co-ordination which makes the book somewhat confusing and difficult to use. We propose now to deal with only a few of the questions raised, in particular those concerned with the traditional account of the first beginnings of the Church and of its Founder.

In order to make critical use of a document such as the Acts of the Apostles as a source of historical information, it is necessary to form some judgment upon its date, purpose and authorship. The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* show no tendency to reverse the recent direction of criticism in favour of a first-century rather than a second-century date for the Acts. They would probably be content with the conclusion reached by Dr. Windisch in his essay in vol. ii., that it very likely belongs to the 'eighties or 'nineties of the first century. They regard the entire Lucan History (comprising the Gospel and Acts) as apologetic in design, and take the view that Theophilus, to whom the work is dedicated,

[1] *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D. Vol. i., *Prolegomena I*. 1920. 18s. Vol. ii., *Prolegomena II., Criticism*. 1922. Macmillan. 18s. and 24s.

was not a convert or prospective convert to Christianity, but a magistrate who had to deal with charges against Christians. The word κατηχήθης in Luke i. 4 might refer to "information" laid before a magistrate just as well as to "instruction" given to a catechumen. The question of authorship is elaborately discussed. Dr. Windisch presents the case against the traditional identification of the author with the medical attendant of Paul, while Mr. Cyril Emmet presents the case for the tradition. The editors themselves discuss the point incidentally in dealing with the "We-passages," and it is evident that Dr. Lake has abandoned his former belief in the Lucan authorship. The question is too intricate to be dealt with here. A good deal of the discussion goes over well-worn ground, while some fresh points are made on either side. The question may fairly be said to be still open.

The identity of the author, however, is after all of less importance than his character as an historian; and this involves the question of the sources he used and the manner in which he used them. The discussion on this point is a solid contribution to scholarship. The method adopted is thoroughly sound: we possess one and only one of the sources used by "Luke," namely, the Gospel according to Mark. Luke's use of his Marcan source, accordingly, is made throughout the discussion the test for all speculative theories as to how he may have used other sources, whose existence is inferred. Dr. Burkitt, who investigates Luke's use of Mark, reaches results which recommend great caution in making such inferences. He shows that Luke reproduces almost the whole of his source, altering even the order but little, and giving in a general sense a faithful rendering of the story. On the other hand, he so thoroughly re-writes the language, and so skilfully dovetails elements from separate sources into a continuous narrative, that if Mark were lost it would be practically impossible to reconstruct the Marcan source from the Gospel according to Luke. The most we could do would be to note the probability that such-and-such a narrative is ultimately Marcan in origin. The editors bear this caution in mind in seeking the sources of Acts. Their clues are primarily the existence of "doublets," such as the double account of the coming of the Spirit and the "experiment in Communism," both in chap. ii. and in chap. iv., and the repeated occurrence of differences in terminology representing different points of view. The prominence of particular persons or places in different sections of the narrative is used with more reserve as an indication of difference of source.

The analysis starts from a review of Harnack's division of sources, and in a general way the present editors confirm Harnack's results. Where they differ from him is chiefly in the direction of greater simplicity and in refusing to follow him into minuter

analysis where the facts seem insufficient to provide a firm basis. Like him, they recognize a two-fold Jerusalem source lying behind a great deal of Acts i.–xv. Its more valuable strain, most easily recognized in chaps. iii.–iv., continues the Galilean tradition which we know through Mark; its inferior strain appears in the alternative account of the same events in chaps. i.–ii., v. 17–42. Beyond chap. v. it is not possible to separate the two strains with any certainty. Perhaps the most important departure from Harnack is the recognition that Acts xi. 19–30 and xv. provide another doublet, and that in xv. we have in effect that version of a famous meeting against which Paul protests in Galatians—the Jerusalem version in all probability—while xi. gives the Antiochene version, which is much nearer to Paul's own.

Careful consideration is accorded to Dr. Torrey's theory of an Aramaic original for Acts i.–xv. Fortified by detailed investigation of Luke's Greek in general, Dr. de Zwaan, to whom this part of the work falls, examines the principal passages alleged by Dr. Torrey in support of his case. He comes to the conclusion that his arguments are strong for chaps. i. 1b—v. 16, ix. 31—xi. 18, less strong for xii. and part of xv., and unconvincing for the remainder. His case therefore for a single Aramaic source for the whole of "I Acts," and consequently against all attempts at source-analysis, does not appear to stand good; while on the other hand he has made it extremely probable that an Aramaic document or documents existed among the sources used by "Luke," whether he translated such documents himself or used them in a translation.

While it is not possible to "reconstruct" these sources in such a way as to compare them in their original form with the form in which "Luke" has given them to us, the editors make the important point that the ideas presented in these early chapters show surprisingly little trace of the theological developments attested by the Pauline epistles and subsequent writings. For instance, there is practically no sacramental doctrine. Baptism does not figure at all in the sections which can with probability be attributed to the superior form of the Jerusalem tradition, and even in the secondary form of the Jerusalem tradition it appears in a hesitating and equivocal form. In fact, so striking is the absence of any definite and consistent account of early Baptism that the editors are inclined to the view that it was not practised until the Seven began their mission outside Judæa. Whether this be so or not (and it is somewhat difficult to accept the view that there was no sort of continuity between the Baptism of John and Christian Baptism), at least it is clear that the author has not introduced into the narrative of his sources any of that sacramental doctrine of Baptism which had become important in the Gentile Church long before any time at which Acts can be sup-

posed to have been written. The same may be said of the treatment of the Holy Spirit in Acts as compared with the Pauline and Johannine doctrine. Whether or no the author was a companion of Paul, it is certain that he has not allowed Paulinism in a dogmatic sense to affect his rendering of his sources. "In the history of ideas Acts is less advanced than the Pauline epistles. . . . If (the author) belonged to the generation which succeeded Paul, or even was contemporary with him, the strange thing is not that he has changed his sources, but that he has changed them so little."

In the presentation of Early Christianity which is sketched on the basis of this source-criticism there are one or two points which we must find room to mention. The crucial importance of the Seven, and of the Hellenistic Christianity which they represented in the development of the Church is brought out clearly. But it is made equally clear that on matters of missionary policy Peter stands beside the Seven in the early narratives of Acts, just as Paul in Galatians assumes that Peter is his natural ally, in spite of vacillations due to mere complaisance or weakness of resolution. One may hope that the old Tübingen antithesis of Peter and Paul, with all that went with it of speculative reconstruction, has now received decent burial. The real adversary of Paul was not Peter but James, and here again our editors make clear how Acts as well as Galatians gives to him the definite rôle of leader of Judaistic Christianity. The difference lies in the fact that Acts does smooth down the abruptness of the opposition. But from another early source we can corroborate the view derived from Galatians of the very sharp division between the policy of Hellenistic Christianity and that of the "right-wing." The Jewish-Christian tradition embodied in the Gospel according to Matthew exhibits a rendering of certain parts of the teaching of Jesus—a rendering not supported by our earlier documents, Mark, "Q," and the source of the independent Lucan tradition—in which we can recognize exactly the position of Paul's adversaries. In Matt. x. 5–23, for instance, we have a version of the Lord's instructions to missionaries in which the elements not derived from Mark or "Q" are just such as could be quoted against Paul; and in v. 17–20 we have an expansion of a "Q" saying into a form whose echoes we seem to catch in the charges of falsifying the Gospel to which Paul has to reply. Is it too fanciful to suggest that when Paul speaks of himself as "the least" or "less than the least of the apostles" he is ironically alluding to the very words which the Judaizers quoted against him as though from the Lord: "Whosoever shall relax one of the least of these precepts and teach men so, shall be called *least* in the kingdom of heaven?"

In considering the beliefs and practices of the early disciples

at Jerusalem, the editors have found it necessary to discuss their antecedents in the career and teaching of Jesus as reported in the Synoptic Gospels. They are thus led to make their contribution to the endless "Quest of the Historical Jesus." It must be confessed that the treatment of this important subject in vol. i. is patchy and hurried as compared with the clear and careful discussions of vol. ii. Little care seems to have been taken to secure consistency of presentation, and it is often difficult indeed to discover what conclusion is indicated. Nevertheless, there is here matter of much interest and significance.

It has come about that for the last twenty years or so the central problem in the historical criticism of the Gospels has been the problem of the significance of the eschatological element in the life and teaching of Jesus. Principally through Dr. Schweitzer's brilliant books we have been made familiar with the view that "consistent eschatology" is the key not only to the teaching of Jesus, but to the course of His ministry. He proclaimed the speedy coming of a miraculous condition of affairs which He called, after contemporary usage, the Kingdom of God; and, believing Himself destined to occupy the central place in that Kingdom, as the Son of Man coming on the clouds, He went up to Jerusalem to stake His life on the expectation of a sudden divine catastrophe which should bring in the Kingdom. For a time this view, worked out in one way or another, seemed to hold the field. Then came signs of a reaction. The present book clearly marks a stage in the reaction. It roundly denies that prior to the time of Jesus Christ the phrase "Kingdom of God" meant specifically a future state of affairs. The phrase itself was abstract and meant the Sovereignty of God. It does not actually occur in pre-Christian writings, though occasional expressions are found which indicate that the term might be loosely used as a description for that future state of affairs in which the Sovereignty of God, already a reality for such as accept His rule, should be openly vindicated; none the less, there is nothing to contravene the general evidence that the expression "Kingdom of God" to a Jew of the first century would bear the primary meaning of a present rule of God in the hearts of men. The recognition of this fact removes a prepossession which has cramped recent attempts at a rendering of the teaching of Jesus, for it makes it possible to give their full value to those numerous passages which on any natural interpretation speak of the Kingdom as present, and have been subjected to various tortures to fit them upon the Procrustean bed of a "consistent eschatology." In fact, if this position may be taken as established, it makes possible advances along this line of interpretation which would probably lead far beyond the limits to which the present editors are willing to go.

The future sense of the expression "Kingdom of God," however, remains, and the editors go so far as to say that on their review of the evidence this sense is the more distinctively Christian. The question is raised, what form of current Jewish eschatological hopes is the basis of the Christian hope of the Kingdom of God. A sharp distinction is drawn between "The Days of the Messiah" and "The Age to Come." In Jewish writings posterior to the Gospels these are two stages in the development of the divine plan. The former stage works itself out on this earth and under the conditions of the present world-order; its central figure is an ideal human ruler of the nation of Israel. This stage is succeeded by the total abolition of the present world-order and the manifestation of the transcendent and eternal rule of God in a transfigured universe: sometimes within this transcendent order a central place is occupied by the Son of Man revealed from heaven. Assuming this clear distinction to have existed in the early first century, the editors conclude that by "The Kingdom of God" Jesus meant "The Age to Come." It may, however, be questioned whether at the time with which we are concerned anything like this elaborate schematism of eschatology was in force. What would appear to be true of the earlier period is that the Good Time Coming was imagined by apocalyptic writers in an almost infinite variety of ways, corresponding to individual standpoints. For some, the Good Time was simply the old prophetic vision of a triumphant Israel with its foot on the neck of the evil world-kingdom (Rome), while for others, no Good Time was worth anything which had not the finality of eternal things and of the immediate presence of God. To say that for Jesus the Kingdom of God was the Age to Come and not the Days of the Messiah only means that His conception of the Good Time had more in common with the more transcendent and universal hope than with the more material and national expectations. It is not legitimate to fill out His account of the Kingdom from any and every account which apocalyptists may give of a miraculous future age.

A further point would seem to call for attention. If it be taken as established that Jesus spoke of the Kingdom both as present and as future, what is the connexion in thought between the two? So far as contemporary Jewish belief takes us, we can only say that God's Kingdom is present in the heart of any man who here and now accepts Him, or in any society which whole-heartedly orders its way after His commandments, and that at some time in the future an act of God will bring it about that this sovereignty is universally recognized, either by the miraculous conversion of all mankind, or by the final subjection or annihilation of the wicked. But an element in the teaching of Jesus which stands outside this scheme is represented by the parables of growth. The Kingdom

is like seed which grows to maturity. The purely "futuristic" interpretation which has been the recently prevailing fashion had to deal with such parables in a way which always seemed somewhat arbitrary, and denied full justice to the natural imagery. It is not the imminence of the final stage but the sheer fact of growth that is emphasized, and in the parable of the seed in Mark iv. 26–29 the gradual stages of growth are selected for special stress. May we not take it that the idea of growth in the moral and spiritual realm is the idea connecting the present with the future conception of the Kingdom? Or rather, if we do full justice to these parables, do they not suggest an original point of view from which the contradiction of present and future disappears? Here is something which seems to lie outside the field of Jewish apocalyptic.

Our editors are cautious indeed about allowing any sort of originality to the teaching of Jesus. He brought no new vision of God and no new ideal of the Kingdom of Heaven. In His public teaching there are only three points in which they can find any essential departure from Jewish ideas current in His time. As against the Zealots—or, as we should perhaps say, the party which afterwards took this name—He urged the policy of non-resistance to oppressors. As against the scribes and Pharisees He adopted a more humane attitude to the "vulgar"—the *Am ha-ares*—and He held that the Law was to be interpreted, in cases of doubt, by reference to the intention of the Legislator rather than by the letter of the statute. Modest differences enough! The wonder is that the world has troubled itself so much about a Rabbi who really had so little to say! It is good that writers from the Christian side should be cautious in their claims on behalf of Christianity as against the Judaism out of which it sprang; but it may be questioned whether caution does not here amount to a studious effort to minimize. Take for instance what is said of Jesus's attitude to "publicans and sinners."

> The attitude of Jesus towards the People of the Land was more sharply opposed to that of the scribes in practice than in principle. He offered the opportunity of entering into the Kingdom of God to publicans and sinners. The fact is undisputed, but without qualification is liable to misconstruction.

The note of extreme caution against overstatement is unmistakable. Yet Dr. G. F. Moore's appendix on *The Am ha-ares* (*the People of the Land*) *and the Haberim* (*Associates*), and Dr. Montefiore's article on *The Spirit of Judaism*, written with much distinction, contain evidence which inclines the reader to think that we are here faced with a difference both of "principle" and of spirit far deeper than the editors are willing to allow. We may place beside their grudging admission of some difference in practice

between Jesus and the scribes in this matter the weighty words of Dr. Montefiore :—

> I should be far from attempting to deny the original elements in the Gospel teaching. The summons not to wait until they meet you in your sheltered and orderly path, but to go forth and seek out and redeem the sinner and the fallen, the passion to heal and bring back to God the wretched and the outcast—all this I do not find in Rabbinism.

Or take the case of the teaching on " non-resistance." It is, of course, important to recognize that in the teaching usually so described Jesus was not speaking " in the air," but had before Him a definite situation created by patriotic propaganda. But is its significance exhausted in an application to contemporary politics ? The editors evidently believe so. We happen to know from another book what one of them thinks of the value of this teaching considered as a permanent contribution to social ethics. " The teaching of Jesus," writes Dr. Lake in *Landmarks of Early Christianity*, " represents a non-resistant attitude which has come to be described as ' pacifist,' and the world has just passed through a crisis which has proved that ' pacifism ' and ' non-resistance ' are impossible policies." Some of us are disposed to think rather that the war proved the bankruptcy of the traditional policies, and constitutes for the Christian community a call to consider once again very seriously these challenging words of the Lord, whether perchance there lies within them some counsel which might save humanity from another such catastrophe. But to isolate the " non-resistance " passages as mere anti-Zealot propaganda is to miss the full significance not only of those passages but of other parts of the teaching. The teaching about love to enemies is intimately related to the attitude to the outcast, and both are to be connected with the teaching and practice of Jesus in regard to forgiveness; nor again is this to be separated from his criticism of the Law. It is by a piecemeal treatment of the sayings that the editors are able to reach their result. Together, this whole mass of teaching points to a bold and consistent conception of God in His dealings with men, which comes with the value and force of a new revelation. To pursue the matter further here is impossible.

It remains to say something of the treatment of the important question of the Messiahship of Jesus. The question is naturally treated primarily in relation to the Christology of the primitive Church, but it is inevitable that the inquiry should be extended into the obscure regions of the " Messianic self-consciousness " of Jesus Himself. On the current Jewish ideas of the time we have a brief but illuminating contribution from Dr. G. F. Moore. He shows very clearly that the term " messiah," or " anointed," was,

at the beginning of the Christian era, still in the main adjectival, and could be applied to a variety of personages, actual or ideal, consecrated to a divine vocation. The fact that two personages receive this appellation does not in any way imply that in Jewish thought they were identical. Thus it is a mistake to suppose that because in the Psalms of Solomon the Son of David is "anointed" and in the book of Enoch the Son of Man is "anointed," there is therefore a direct connexion of any kind between these figures. The terms "messiah" and "messianic" have been far too widely and loosely used in modern books, and the assumption that in the time of Jesus there was a body of accurately defined "messianic doctrine" with which religious Jews in general might be assumed to be familiar is not justified by the evidence. In particular, the general belief that at that period there was a widespread expectation of a "Messiah" who should be a national leader in wars of conquest is described as "wholly false." At the same time it is admitted that an ideal ruler of Israel in the future *was* expected, and that the term "The Anointed" was given to him in popular speech. If this be granted, then the associations of the Son of David, who is "The Lord's Anointed" in the Psalms of Solomon, point to a conception not so far removed after all from the warrior Messiah of some of the Targums. In any case, however, it is a matter of much importance to have the considered judgment of Dr. Moore that "the Gospels give sufficient evidence of the belief, common among all classes, that a divinely appointed head of the people should one day appear, with whom better days would come; that this deliverer should be a descendant of the royal house of Judah, the Son of David, in whom the monarchy was to be restored; and that 'the anointed' (king), in Hebrew *mashiḥ*, messiah, was a popular name for this figure." It is important because the extreme eschatological school has denied that the term "messiah" could suggest in the time of Jesus a human figure at all. Here is one more point in which the book marks a definite stage in the reaction against "consistent eschatology."

It is difficult to discover what is the view of the editors themselves on the messianic claims attributed to Jesus. They deny that He believed Himself to be the Son of David. That He used the term Son of Man in a sense most like that given to it in the Parables of Enoch they think certain, but they are uncertain whether He applied it to Himself. The frequent association in our Gospels of the designation Son of Man with references to the Passion they consider likely to be due to Greek Christians, who did not fully understand the meaning of the term and for whom the idea of a suffering Messiah had been created by the fact that Jesus, believed to be the Son of Man, had actually suffered. The only secure data which they appear to leave are the heavenly

voices at the Baptism and Transfiguration and the cry of dereliction on the Cross. The latter they hold to be impossible of invention, and to indicate that Jesus identified Himself at that moment with the Suffering Righteous of Psalms like the twenty-second. The discussion of these Psalms of the Righteous and the connexion of their central ideas with those of 2 Isaiah on the one hand and the Wisdom of Solomon on the other is interesting and valuable. It was the Hellenistic Christians of the school of Stephen and Philip, our editors think, who first identified Jesus with the Suffering Servant of Isa. liii. Yet they show clearly that thoughts akin to those of the "Servant-songs" were in the mind of Jesus Himself. The "Beloved Son" of the Baptism and Transfiguration is held to refer rather to the idea of the righteous as a son of God, as we have it for instance in Wisdom ii., than to any specifically "messianic" circle of ideas.

The whole discussion is inconclusive, but by a process of suggestion which rarely commits them to any definite denial the editors have succeeded in conveying an impression which is almost wholly negative. Instead of attempting to pursue their argument stage by stage, it will perhaps be well to try to set forth what seem to the present writer to be the more important inferences which can reasonably be drawn from such evidence as we have.

The early Jerusalem source of Acts iii.–iv., which is recognized by Jackson and Lake as the best tradition we have of the primitive Church, describes Jesus as "the destined Anointed One whom the heavens must receive until the times of the Restoration of the Universe" (i.e. the Son of Man of Enoch), as the Anointed Son of God of Psa. ii. (which, as Dr. Moore states, was interpreted by both Jews and Christians as referring to the ideal ruler of the future), and as the Holy Servant of God whom He glorified and anointed (cf. Isa. lii. 13, lxi. 1). This evidence is confirmed, on one side at least, by that of Mark and "Q," which (on Jackson and Lake's showing) proves that the early Church applied to Jesus the titles "Anointed," "Son of Man," and "Son of God" (as well as "Son of David").

In view of these facts it cannot well be denied that the Church, at the earliest period of which we have any knowledge, regarded Jesus as the "Anointed" in a well-recognized sense, differentiated from the use of the term as a mere epithet of various functionaries (such as the High Priest); and that they identified Him with the Elect One, or Anointed of the Parables of Enoch, the Son of Man destined to come to judgment on the clouds of heaven. But could such a view of Jesus have originated after the Crucifixion, if it had not existed, in some form and in some degree, before that catastrophe? It was created by the resurrection appearances, it may be said. But in the absence of some such belief the psychological

conditions for the resurrection appearances would appear to be lacking. There is, therefore, a strong presumption that the disciples had entertained during the lifetime of their Master at least the nucleus of their subsequent belief about His person.

It is from this point of view that we approach the record of Peter's "confession" at Cæsarea Philippi, an incident which Jackson and Lake admit to be historical. Peter is recorded to have said: "You are the Anointed." It is possible that this is the earliest recorded occurrence of the term "The Anointed" (as distinct from "the Lord's Anointed," "My Anointed," and the like), and that makes its interpretation difficult. If we could accept the Lucan form of the confession, "The Anointed of God," we should have a form more close to normal pre-Christian usage. In any case, Peter surely used the term in a specific sense. If Moore is right, the most likely specific sense on the lips of a Jew of that time would be that of the ideal national ruler of the future. It is to be observed that in the narrative of Mark Jesus is represented, not indeed as repudiating the designation, but as disturbed rather than gratified by Peter's words and as proceeding at once to communicate a piece of teaching which shocked the disciples. To this we shall return presently.

The other important passage in which the term "The Anointed" meets us in the Gospels is in the Trial narrative, which is also accepted by our editors as historical. The High Priest asked Jesus: "Are you the Anointed, the Son of the Blessed?" Here again "The Anointed" is clearly a designation with a specific meaning. It is difficult to assign any other meaning than that of the ideal national ruler of the future. "Son of the Blessed" would then be applied to this ruler in accordance with the traditional interpretation of Psa. ii. and kindred passages. That such was in fact the High Priest's meaning is confirmed by the form which the alleged self-designation of Jesus took in the charge-sheet presented to Pilate. "King of the Jews" is simply the religious conception of the "anointed" ruler of Israel done into language intelligible to a Roman. The remarkable thing is that Jesus found Himself able, indeed compelled, to accept the designation. Yet He did not leave it at that. He went on to make a solemn pronouncement that His judges should see "the Son of Man coming with the clouds." It is difficult to see the relevance of this statement at such a moment unless it is intended to apply to the Person who has just been described as the Anointed. The easiest interpretation, where all interpretations are difficult, seems to be that Jesus, accepting the description of Himself as "The Anointed, the Son of the Blessed," wished to suggest that this title was more fitly applied to a more august personage than the Son of David, that in fact the ideal ruler of the future could be no other than

the eternal Man from Heaven. This seems to be in harmony with the most natural interpretation of Mark xii. 35–37, where "Son of David" is shown to be an inadequate description of "The Anointed." These passages lead us to suspect that Jesus's conception of His calling and destiny had points of contact both with the ideal Ruler of God's People and with the Man from Heaven, but was not exhausted in either.

We may now return to Cæsarea Philippi, for there, as in the Trial narrative, Mark gives us the transition from "The Anointed" in the mouth of the interlocutor to "The Son of Man" in the mouth of Jesus Himself. It is true that we have the reply of Jesus only in *oratio obliqua*, so that it is open to anyone to hold that the title "Son of Man" was introduced in the course of paraphrasing the actual words used. Yet the same term occurs in the *oratio recta* forms of the saying in Mark ix. 30–32, x. 32–34, and the only real ground for suspecting it either there or here is that the idea of suffering goes ill with the traditional conception of the Son of Man. But is not that the very point of the scene? Peter was scandalized, not because or not principally because he saw suffering looming in the future for himself or for his Master, but because to attribute suffering and rejection to the glorious Man from Heaven was a shocking thing. In the light of this read what Peter is reported to have said in the early Jerusalem source (Acts iii. 18): "*This* is how God has fulfilled what He proclaimed in advance through the mouth of all the prophets—that His Anointed must suffer." At last he has learnt to yoke together these incompatible terms. It does not therefore seem altogether just to our sources to accept "Son of Man" in predictions of glory and judgment and to reject it in predictions of suffering.

How far ideas derived from 2 Isaiah were connected in the mind of Jesus with the thought of His own sufferings it is more difficult to say with certainty. But the refusal of Jackson and Lake to see in Acts iii. 13, iv. 27 allusions to the Isaianic Servant of Jahweh seems almost unnecessarily sceptical. Moreover, they have not said the final word about the possible reference to Isa. liii. in Mark x. 45, or the apparent echo of "Servant" passages in the "Q" saying given in Matt. xi. 5, Luke vii. 22. It is true that this latter passage does not introduce the idea of suffering, but if Jesus did accept the rôle of the Servant of the Lord in the sense of 2 Isaiah, He can hardly have stopped short of the destiny of the Servant in Isa. liii., especially since, as we have seen, he recognized in His own fate the sorrows of the Suffering Righteous of the Psalms.

Finally, our editors appear to minimize quite arbitrarily the importance of the "Q" passages in which Jesus is described, or describes Himself, as Son of God. The temptation narrative

receives merely a passing allusion, and the passage in Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22 is discounted. It is of course true that the source-criticism of the Gospels is not a final test of the authenticity of sayings; yet the agreement of Matthew and Luke is clear evidence of a documentary source older than either, and the reconstruction of this source on the basis of their agreement gives a document whose claim to respect is more and more generally admitted. This respect Jackson and Lake grant to "Q" in the main, but it fails when they are confronted with passages such as those we have just mentioned. Yet it is doubtful if the saying in Matt. xi. 27 would ever have been impugned if it had not happened to coincide so remarkably with the Church's language of faith. But is anyone prepared to lay down the canon of criticism that what Jesus said of Himself can never have agreed with what the Church came to believe about Him? That He believed Himself to have been greeted by a heavenly voice as the Son of God our editors appear to grant. So much Mark tells us. Now, if we put together Mark and "Q," we find that "Son of God" was not a current self-designation of Jesus, but one especially associated with moments of intense religious experience such as the early Christians ascribed to possession by the Spirit of God. That the experiences attending the Baptism and the Transfiguration can only be understood as "pneumatic," needs only to be stated. The Temptation is presented by Mark and "Q" in the same light; and Luke shows his sense of the true character of the saying about Father and Son in vii. 22 by introducing it in the form "Jesus exulted in the Spirit and said . . ." May we not find here some clue to the meaning of the term "Son of God" as Jesus used it? It described not an office (like "Anointed") or a destiny (like "Servant of Jahweh"), but a mystical experience. "None knows the Son but the Father; none knows the Father but the Son." The terms used are those proper to mystical communion. The intimacy and uniqueness of the communion they indicate justified the early theologians of the Church in inquiring, as the author of the Fourth Gospel inquired, what might be their ultimate implications for metaphysics.

Here we must leave the matter. The enigma of the self-consciousness of Jesus can hardly be dismissed so easily as vol. i. of *The Beginnings of Christianity* might suggest.

C. Harold Dodd.

PREACHERS I HAVE KNOWN

The Editor has suggested to me that I should write an article for this first number of the new "Quarterly" on "Preachers I have known." Apart from this suggestion, which was of the nature of a request, I should scarcely have ventured to deal with a subject of this kind, partly from a sense of general inadequacy, and partly because the subject is one which could not easily be treated without such an intrusion of the personal element as would be distasteful to myself, and perhaps equally distasteful to my readers. But Editors always know best, and I can only hope that I may be forgiven the degree of egotism which seems to be inevitable in the circumstances. I propose to speak only of preachers with whom I have come into some sort of personal contact, and to say nothing, though much might be said, of men who are still living.

The preacher whom I naturally knew the best, and whom I heard preach most frequently, was my own father. It is forty-seven years since he died, and there cannot be many left who remember him, and who would be much interested in anything I could have to say about him. But filial piety forbids my passing over in silence one to whom I owe so much, and whose memory I cherish with affection and gratitude. As a preacher he was not quite like any other I have known. A Welshman—and a very loyal Welshman—his sermons had none of the qualities which seem to have characterized those he had been accustomed to hear and to admire in his youth. There was nothing in them of that picturesque, and sometimes rather fanciful, treatment of Bible characters in which those famous orators were wont to indulge. I cannot, for instance, for a moment imagine my father dealing with the story of the translation of Enoch in the fashion in which it was dealt with in a sermon in an old volume I found once in a lodging-house in Pembrokeshire. The writer of that sermon described in the most graphic way the perplexity and consternation of Enoch's wife on the evening of the day on which her husband disappeared. He pictured her going from house to house among her neighbours and asking this one and that whether he or she had seen anything of her husband, and re-echoed her plaintive exclamation that they had been married three hundred years, and that she had never known her husband out so late at night before! It was all very vivid, no doubt, but it was not in the least in my father's line. He was eminently practical and logical. In his student days at Glasgow he had won the prize for logic in a class of a hundred and fifty men. What he cared for, and wanted other people to care for, was the sober, solemn truth, and without

rhetoric, without ornament, in the simplest and most convincing way that was possible to him, he drove home the very serious things he had to say to the conscience and understanding of his hearers. He talked to them as a man of affairs would talk to his associates on a pressing matter of business, or as a father would talk to his children of dangers the gravity of which they did not sufficiently realize. I always thought he owed much to the example and influence of John Foster, with whom, though a much younger man, he was on terms of intimate friendship. He was often to be found in Foster's untidy study, and had the privilege once of receiving him as a guest in his own house. I have in my possession the last letter Mr. Foster wrote, a letter written to Joseph Cottle, whose niece my father had married, in which he speaks of his satisfaction at hearing that "Mr. Thomas was in better health, and the deep regret that he felt at the disablement of such a mind for public service by the infirmity of its frail bodily vehicle." "I cannot read the Fathers," my father said once, "they are too prolix for me. I prefer Father Foster;" and from Father Foster he certainly learned much, while the emotional fervour of his own Celtic nature added greatly to the impressiveness of his public utterances. It would not, however, be fitting for me to say more of one of whom I could not be expected to speak in a spirit of perfect detachment. Those who knew him personally, and heard him preach, will remember what he was like, but no one would find it easy to give an adequate idea to those who never had these opportunities.

When I was just thirteen years old I went to school at Mill Hill, and in the Michaelmas holidays following my brother and I were allowed to join our parents for a few days in London, when we had the opportunity of seeing the sights and hearing some of the notable preachers. On the Sunday morning we made our way to the Metropolitan Tabernacle, which had been opened a few months previously. It was not a successful venture. There was a great crowd, and much difficulty in obtaining seats, and after standing waiting for a little time my father's patience gave way and he determined to go and try his chances at the Weigh House, and I do not think we boys were sorry to get out into the air again. I heard Mr. Spurgeon on two or three occasions later, once at the Tabernacle, and once at Christ Church, Westminster, when he preached the Annual Sermon for the London Missionary Society. He came also once to New College, where I had been allowed for one session to hear some of the lectures. His visit was on a matter of business, but he was asked to say a few words to the students, to whom he spoke in his easy, unconventional way, his final word of counsel to them being that whenever they chanced to meet the devil they were to be sure to have a shot at him. It would be an impertinence on my part to eulogize Spurgeon's preaching, character, or work.

His fame is settled beyond all dispute. But I cannot honestly say that his teaching ever appealed to me in any powerful way. There was a new leaven at work in those days, and sermons like those of Robertson of Brighton touched me, and I think many others of my age, more deeply, and awakened a readier response than the Evangelicalism of Mr. Spurgeon. We read Dr. Young's *Christ of History* with much sympathy, and later Seeley's *Ecce Homo* came home to us with extraordinary force. I was frequently in Seeley's house in Camden Town when I was a boy, and during my first long vacation at Cambridge I spent a month under the same roof with him at Barmouth, being a member of a reading party which he was conducting, so that with a great admiration for his intellect and his learning, and not less for the moral elevation of his character, it was natural that my attitude towards the Christian religion should come somewhat to resemble his own. Then there were Tennyson and Browning, with all the implications of their poetry commending to our youthful minds a theology which was not exactly the theology of the schools, but which seemed to us to be profoundly true and credible, and won our willing assent.

Of our experience at the Weigh House that Sunday morning I have no very clear recollection. Boys of thirteen have seldom any great hunger for sermons, and I am afraid I found Mr. Binney a little above me and beyond me, but I remember that my father found the service eminently satisfying. He could always appreciate Mr. Binney, and his admiration was, I know, very fully reciprocated. In after years, for my father's sake, he took the kindest possible interest in me, and did his best when my student days were ended to get me settled in some congenial Church. I believe he was a little disappointed sometimes to find that Churches refused to take me at his own valuation, and preferred to judge for themselves, and he said to me once, in defiance of all the most sacred Congregational principles, that he often wished he could be empowered to put down young men where he believed they might be useful, whether the Churches wanted them or not! I do not suppose his sermons are much read nowadays. He is said to have remarked that he could preach a worse sermon than any man in London, and probably sometimes, when he was unprepared, or not in the mood, the sermon was pretty bad. But at his best he was very weighty and impressive. The argument was built up with great care and thoroughness, and if you could accept his premisses, as men generally did without demur in those days, you could not fail to be convinced. He was a great man in every way, and I suspect there were many who could say that, much as they admired the force and cogency of his sermons, it was the man rather than the preacher who won their devotion and their love. He was very humble at heart, and said at the end of his life, realizing, I imagine, that dialectics cannot carry men very

far in the interpretation of the deep things of God, that he was willing to receive the Kingdom of Heaven as a little child.

In the afternoon of that rather exhausting Sunday we were taken to St. Paul's to hear Henry Melville. When a student at Highbury College my father had frequently gone to hear Mr. Melville, then in his prime, in the company of his chief friend at college, Mr. Henry Richard, and no doubt he wished his sons to enjoy the same privilege. We had dined well. It was a sleepy time of day, and we were put, I cannot tell how or why, into some cushioned stalls which were dangerously comfortable. I am not able therefore to give a very coherent account of the service, but a dim picture rises before my mind of the great church with its gloomy splendour, and of an aged man in the pulpit with a shock of white hair, who was discoursing in a sonorous voice on some subject which failed to grip the attention of one at least of his hearers. The service was over at last, but the labours of the day were not yet ended. In the evening we were marched off again, this time to Albany Street, near Regent's Park, to a chapel of which Thomas Jones, then recently come to London, was the minister. I remember how the long street with its endless rows of lamps impressed me, and how on our arrival we were placed in the end gallery, far away from the preacher. My father had known something, I think, of Thomas Jones in his early days. He had seen, when he was a boy, his father taken out of a pond on which he had been skating, the ice having given way, and he told me that the first time he ever saw skates was when he noticed those that were attached to the drowned man's shoes. And now he was interested in Thomas Jones's growing reputation. I have no clear idea what the sermon was about, but I remember that it was a different kind of thing from that which we had listened to at the Weigh House, or at St. Paul's.

Four years later, when I had become a student at University College in Gower Street, I took a sitting in the chapel in North London, to which Thomas Jones—as everyone called him—had migrated, and I heard him preach every Sunday. It was certainly wonderful preaching, having all the appearance of extreme naturalness and simplicity, though no doubt everything was prepared, even the effective asides and homeliest colloquialisms, with the greatest care. Poetry there was and passion, and humour which seemed spontaneous enough, but there was consummate art in it all. The music was in the bounds of law. There was little of the elaborate argumentation which characterized Mr. Binney's sermons. It was the human side of the Gospels, and of the Gospel, which appealed to Thomas Jones. He described what he saw and he gave us pictures, not doctrines in the abstract. Truths were set before us not in their intrinsic nature, or as they could be proved or analysed by the intellect, but as they had quickened the emotions or kindled the

imagination of the preacher himself. He did not move men as Spurgeon did. It was a different kind of appeal, but it was often very powerful, and you were made to feel how much there was in religion besides being saved in any narrow sense of the word. It was a sort of preaching that I never felt tempted to imitate, but I could enjoy it, and was able, I hope, in some degree to profit by it. I sat where I could look into the face of Robert Browning, who was a very regular attendant, and who has spoken in the warmest terms of his appreciation of Thomas Jones's ministry.

After a year and a half at Mill Hill, I was sent to a school at Clifton, and one morning in the week when the missionary meetings were being held in Bristol the Headmaster, at my father's request, allowed my brother and myself to leave school and trudge down to Bridge Street Chapel, long since abandoned, where Samuel Martin of Westminster was to preach the sermon. As usual, we were put into the gallery—they did that with boys in those days—and I remember well the figure and face of Mr. Martin in the pulpit in the dim distance. It was a beautiful face and obviously the face of a saint. Everyone felt that, though there were some who were wicked enough to say that if it had not clearly been the face of a saint, it might have been the face of one very far removed from sainthood. Beautiful it was assuredly, but those eyes might have any hidden meaning in them, and that firm mouth turned down a little at the corners might conceivably have suggested some dark and sinister purpose to be carried out with relentless tenacity. However, no one doubted that Samuel Martin was a saint, and that he looked one, and that it was practically impossible for anyone to be really quite so saintly as he looked. He preached on that occasion on the text "For My Sake," and the sermon was felt by all present, I believe, to be immensely moving. It was in the preacher's characteristic style, solemn, tender, persuasive, searching. I saw much of Mr. Martin a few years later. He was good enough to wish me to be his assistant at Westminster, and I preached several times in his chapel, and was often his guest. But his suggestion came to nothing. Evidently I was not the kind of man that his people were looking for. But I was always grateful for the experience and opportunities of those few weeks. There was much that a young man might learn from one so wholly consecrated to his work, and I always found him most gentle and kind. He offered the prayer at my ordination at Ealing, and a devout old man who was present said afterwards that it was like being in heaven to listen to the grave accents of that pleading voice. The voice, I may say, was of a remarkable quality, not loud at all, but low and clear, and singularly penetrating. I remember once, when I was standing in the lobby at Westminster and the doors were shut, I could hear the low tones of the opening prayer with perfect distinctness. Voice and face and figure and

manner all helped, but behind these there was a soul of noble simplicity and beautiful piety, and I am sure that Samuel Martin deserved all the love and honour which were so freely accorded to him.

On the evening of that day when I heard him in Bristol James Parsons was preaching in another of our city churches, and we boys—it was a little severe upon us perhaps—were driven down in a four-wheeled cab to hear him. He was not in the least like the preacher of the morning, but was equally impressive in his own way. Without movement or action of any kind, with a voice weak and high pitched and somewhat monotonous, he dealt out to us in orderly array his well-balanced sentences and periods till he reached a climax. Then he paused, and the whole congregation began coughing and shuffling and blowing their noses. I cannot but think they did it largely, not because they had any particular need to cough or to blow their noses, but because they felt they must do something, no matter what, to relieve the tension to which they had been exposed in listening to this strange orator, and waiting till the crisis towards which he was carrying them should arrive. But it was not the manner alone or chiefly that arrested their attention. The preacher dealt with the great fundamentals, and pressed home his appeals with extraordinary and ever accumulating force. In private he was delightful, genial and kind, and with a fund of stories which he loved to tell.

In some ways James Parsons's style resembled that of Canon Liddon, whom I heard in the University pulpit at Cambridge. There was the same carefully constructed argument and the same steady advance towards a definite conclusion. But Liddon had a more melodious voice and more of the graces of the rhetorician. He was never obscure even in our University pulpit, as some men seem to have thought it suitable to be. Dr. Fairbairn used to tell us of a working man who once stood by his side when the Canon was preaching at St. Paul's. "Ever heard him before?" whispered his neighbour to Fairbairn, who replied with a shake of the head. "Ah," continued the man, "you won't understand him at first. He takes a deal of follerin'." But even people less intelligent than Fairbairn could follow Liddon without much difficulty. He was indeed impatient of obscurity in himself or others, and spoke once, not wholly in jest, of the kind of mist which he professed to see hanging over Westminster when Westcott was in residence. He even liked, some of us may have felt, to make things out to be clearer than they really are. After all, we were disposed to ask: Is everything so certain and so intelligible, and can we deal with mysteries as though there were nothing mysterious about them? Another great preacher at Cambridge in my time, who was truly often a little hard to follow, was the Professor of Moral Philosophy, Frederic

Maurice. I remember that Henry Sidgwick, whose keen and penetrating mind insisted on having everything thought out with as much exactness as was possible, said to me once that he thought Maurice rather preferred to see things in a mist. This was a little hard, perhaps, but if Maurice said, as is reported, that you must on no account reject the doctrine of eternal punishment provided only you understood that punishment did not mean punishment and that eternal did not mean eternal—if he said things like this one might be excused for asking him what precisely he did mean. But I loved Maurice, clear or obscure. I was charmed by the sweet severity of his face and the moving tones of his voice. I was every week in his house, where he had a kind of private class and discoursed to us freely about Locke and other celebrities less interesting to me than himself. He had spent his boyhood at Bristol, and I remember once how at some party that he gave he talked to me pleasantly about the old Bristol names with which he had been familiar. He never taught you very much that you could make use of in examinations, but he did help you and inspire you in other ways that were much more important. It was worth going to Cambridge if only to come near this saintly apostle and prophet.

Of other preachers of more recent times, but belonging to a generation now passed away, how many happy memories I could recall! I think of John Stoughton, a fellow student of my father's, and always his affectionate friend. He was the man of letters, the scholar, the historian, suggesting by his dignified mien and general appearance, to say nothing of his intimacy with many Deans and Bishops, the seclusion of the cathedral close. It may be that he seemed to hold aloof from some of the interests and activities of his brethren, but that was because his study had such irresistible attractions for him, and those who knew him as my father did, and as I did, were well aware that, while enjoying the society of eminent Churchmen, he was never anything but absolutely loyal to old friends and to the principles which he professed. Effusive he was not, but those mistook him greatly who supposed him to be unsociable or cold.

His most intimate friend was Joshua Harrison, on whose countenance were engraved what an old poet calls the " lineaments of Gospell bookes." No man whom I have known personified more perfectly that beautiful thing we call graciousness. To see him in the pulpit was better than many sermons, and every word that he spoke carried with it its own appeal. Such impressions cannot be forgotten, but neither can they be described. He was a Christian and a gentleman, as every true Christian must be, and he had a heart of gold. What more can one say?

Allon of Islington also was one of the great names of those departed days; a noticeable man, with his silvery hair, his affable, hospitable ways; and a man of business, too, shrewd and with a gift for adminis-

tration; an admirable preacher, and a musician who did more than any man to improve the psalmody of our churches. He would have made an excellent Bishop. I dined with him once when Mr. Gladstone was one of his guests, and I remember how surprised I was at the freedom and emphasis with which Gladstone, who sat just opposite to me, spoke of some of his contemporaries. He told us of his habits, of his capacity for sleep, how he was never kept awake by any anxiety except once when he had started to cut down a tree and was unable to finish the job before night came on; though he corrected himself by admitting that there was, he believed, one other occasion when he could not get to sleep quite readily, some trifling question of forming an administration being laid upon his mind! He talked, too, in an interesting way of his recollections of Oxford, and of Newman, and said in his graphic manner that Newman held the University in the hollow of his hand.

It was never my good fortune to hear or to see the famous Cardinal. But his brother Francis, once a preacher, though not in my time, I met in Bristol, where he resided for some years. My father knew him and took me to call upon him. I see him now seated at his desk in his shirtsleeves with a bearskin cloak thrown over his shoulders and looking with his keen face and pointed beard like a typical American editor. He was most kind to me, and hearing that I was preparing for Cambridge, offered to read Latin with me, a valuable offer, for he was an exceptionally brilliant Latin scholar. He talked of having met his brother recently after long silence and separation. Then his wife came in and laid her hand affectionately upon him. She belonged to the Brethren, but had no anxieties about her husband's ultimate fate. She was sure he had once been "under grace," and did not doubt that God would bring him again into the light. She was good enough to give my father and myself, as we left the house, a copy of an Evangelical tract, entitled *Happy John, or the Dying Policeman.* I heard Mr. Newman lecture once on "Theism," in Bristol. As he was developing his argument some gentleman in the audience, having heard of the lecturer's writings, and not able to grasp his present purpose, stood up and cried, "Christ came to put that right," and marched out. Newman followed his retreating footsteps with hurried explanations of his meaning and aim. But it was no good. The man held on his way, and the lecture was resumed.

Time, and certainly space, would fail me to tell of all those distinguished men among the Congregationalists, now passed away, whom I have known, whose praise is in all the churches, and whose achievements are our common inheritance—of Dale, with his splendid force, his massive eloquence, and his tender piety and beautiful humility of soul; and Rogers, so often his companion-in-arms, the

most vigorous of combatants, and the most generous of friends, and indeed of foes ; of Raleigh, one of our most trusted leaders and a great artist in sermons ; of Newman Hall, a man of tireless energy and a most effective expounder of the Gospel as he understood it ; of Baldwin Brown, who looked at things from a different angle, a free lance, who preached his gospel with immense earnestness and a spiritual passion which secured for him the loyal attachment of many of the younger men ; of Enoch Mellor, the orator of the North, but known and admired through the whole country ; of Edward White, who could have cut us all to pieces with the keen edge of his wit if he had not been the excellent Christian that he was ; of Thomas Lynch, so different from everyone else, the dreamer, the poet. I went to hear him one wet Sunday morning in his depressing iron chapel in Mornington Crescent. The congregation was scanty, and the preacher seemed to feel that the situation was not very exhilarating. When he came to the sermon he began to talk about David, then paused and said innocently and sadly, " I wonder when we are going to have another fine Sunday. Sunday should always be a sunshiny day." I forget what happened next. We could not answer him, but I felt it was all interesting in its way, though unusual.

But the list is endless. One name, however, I must not pass over. Joseph Parker was something of an enigma, and there were those who did not quite know what to make of him. Some American minister said that he reminded him of Jeremiah's two baskets of figs, one containing very good figs and the other very naughty figs. Well, some things that Parker did or said did strike his critics as being rather naughty. But it must be remembered that the standard of pulpit propriety was more austere in those days than it is to-day. It must be remembered, too, that Parker, strong and brilliant man as he was, was yet, in some not unpleasing ways, a child to the end of his life. And children who are really nice are always naughty sometimes. Almost the last time I heard him he made some announcements. He said he had been invited to preach for the Baptist Missionary Society, or something to that effect, on Wednesday, and also had been invited to preach for the Wesleyan Missionary Society on Thursday, and, he continued, " I should have preached for the Church Missionary Society on Friday, but—I have not been invited." That was the odd, unexpected kind of thing he would say. But who could be angry, at least for more than a moment, who was able to appreciate his real power and essential goodness? Edward White was angry with him once, but he turned in at the City Temple and came away saying, " I have forgiven him all his sins." It should have cost no tremendous effort.

Dr. Parker came down to Bath near the end of his life to unveil a tablet to the memory of William Jay at Argyle Chapel. I was

there, and I think he was glad to fall in with someone he knew pretty well. Anyway, he got me to sit by him at luncheon and accompany him to the chapel. There was a crowd assembled, and the Mayor in a dignified way made a suitable little speech, which he concluded by saying how good it was of so busy and distinguished a man as Dr.—— Then he paused, and in a horrible moment of forgetfulness turned in despair to me and said in an audible whisper, "What's his name ?" "Parker," I replied, and the speech ended a little lamely.

Of Fairbairn, too, that prodigy of learning, who was yet full of boyish fun and spirits, I must speak one word of grateful affection. His preaching was often too tremendous for the ordinary mortal. His sermons carried you along as a river in spate, or perhaps overwhelmed you. They were magnificent, but too much for human nature's weekly food. But what a companion he was ! He talked to you as though you knew almost as much as he did, and in his warm-hearted friendliness did you so much more than justice. That at least was how I felt about it. I can never be grateful enough for his personal kindness and for all that I learned from his books and his conversation.

Forsyth, whom we have lost so recently, I made friends with fifty years ago, and we have always been on affectionate terms. To my mind he was a great catholic preacher, not always quite easy to understand, but that was in part because he voyaged in strange seas and ascended to celestial heights. When a man is dealing with the common things that round us lie he has little excuse for not being intelligible, but when he is speaking of the relations between the soul of man and the Eternal God it is a different matter : and these were the things with which Forsyth concerned himself. You might not see the way very clearly before you, when he was at his best, but you felt that you were in the heavenly places, and if the air was difficult to breathe it was very pure and stimulating.

To the memory of Silvester Horne also I should like to pay my loyal tribute of sincere regard. The story of his life has been admirably written, and there are men living to-day who were more intimately associated with him than myself, who could amplify the story, if they would, far more effectually than I could. But how dear he was to us all, and how proud we were of him ! I couple him with Charles Berry, or with Eric Lawrence, both men of the finest temper and of rare ability. Horne was unsurpassed on the platform. His preaching, like Fairbairn's, had almost too much strain and vigour in it for those who were most readily moved by a quieter style. But Horne's energy would not submit to control, even by himself. And yet he was ever the very gentle, perfect knight. I was greatly drawn to him—as who would not be ?—and I marvelled

constantly at the ample resources he had at command, and the readiness and adroitness with which he could draw upon them. I never knew him embarrassed or in a difficulty. Yes, I did once, now I think of it. It was when we went with two other friends to visit the Trappist Monastery on the St. Lawrence. We were taken through the buildings and shown the grounds, and an excellent luncheon was set before us, including some sort of wine. I am afraid the rest of us took without demur the good the gods provided. But Horne was nothing if not conscientious, and he let the bottle severely alone. This was a position our genial host failed to understand. The only explanation must be that that particular wine did not suit his guest, and another kind was quickly set before him. That was equally unacceptable, and yet a third bottle was brought in with the same result. "Ah," said the hospitable monk, "you would perhaps care to try our Communion wine. I will get a bottle." And get it he did. By this time, as Professor Armitage, who has a much more exact and vivid memory for such incidents than I have, tells the story, poor Horne was faced by a sheaf of bottles containing wines of every hue. Then, not actuated, I believe, by any real curiosity on the subject, but moved by a laudable desire to keep the conversation going, he inquired whether the monks made cider. "Cider," was the prompt reply, "oh certainly, you shall have some cider in a moment." Dear Horne! it was good to see such a brilliant and resourceful person put for once into such a corner.

I could write a book about the preachers I have known in Bristol during my long ministry—my fellow-citizens and fellow-workers, whose goodness to me has been wonderful, and my association with whom has been of the greatest help to me and a source of much happiness. Especially I should like to have said something of my nearest neighbours and very dear friends, Urijah Thomas and Richard Glover, who, though I had had little experience when I came to Bristol, and was their junior by ten years, received me with the most generous kindness and on terms of equality, and upon my intercourse with whom no shadow of a cloud has ever rested. They were both well-known men, but only those who knew them as intimately as I did could justly appreciate their nobility and charm of character, or the singleness of heart with which they devoted themselves to the service of God and man. I was indeed fortunate to be able to take up the burden of my responsible duties in Bristol with the help of the constant sympathy and wise counsel of two such neighbours.

All this gossiping must now cease. I hope I shall not be blamed for dealing with my subject with too little seriousness, or taking in vain the names of the distinguished men to whom I have referred. If I had not loved them, I would have said nothing about them.

But I loved them, not alone for their shining virtues, their religious zeal, and their great achievements, but not less for all that was in them—and there was so much—that was most human and most endearing, and I cannot think that anyone will love or honour them the less for anything that I have ventured to say.

H. Arnold Thomas.

GATEWAYS TO THE WORLD

Not long before he died the late Lord Bryce told me he was convinced that God had given the victory to the British people in the recent war in order that they might fling across from the various parts of the great Commonwealth of British Nations those ideals of commerce and justice without which a nation cannot be great. At the time he uttered it, it seemed to be a significant statement coming from such an authority. It suggests the true reason for the existence of our Empire, and reveals what he believed to be our distinctive spiritual task.

God is challenging the British people to fling across into other lands, not merely ideals of justice and commerce, but also those vital things for which the Christian Church stands. Men speak of "Outposts" of Empire, but they are in reality "Gateways" to the heathen world. If we neglect these gateways, we cannot hope to win the whole wide world for Christ. In this connexion I instinctively think of many neglected mining camps in Rhodesia, where I have seen men spending their Sundays without any thought whatever of Church or of God, while within two or three miles a foreign missionary has been trying to evangelize the heathen. After a casual service a rough miner in one of these camps said: "Parson, we're not saints nor angels here, but we haven't forgotten all that we learned from the old folk and in the Sunday-school. This is a tight little town. There's nothing to do but work and drink and sleep. No Company ever comes our way, and we're tired of hearing our own talent. Won't you come regularly and give us a service? We'll all roll up. The blacks have got their teachers, and yet we haven't. They teach the blacks, why not the whites?" What must be the influence of such a camp on the work of a foreign missionary? No one man, however splendid he may be in pluck and consecration, can compete with the godlessness of two or three hundred men.

One of the most significant facts of Christian missions to-day is that we British people can express our Christianity within the limits of our own Empire, and yet in direct contact with heathen lands.

A. G. S.

INDUSTRIAL CHAOS AND THE WAY OUT

THE idea of function as applied to industry has by no means received the consideration which so important a matter requires. The failure to consider such an idea in relation to the greatest and most essential of social activities is the more strange in view of the fact that, as a people, we, nominally at all events, profess a religion which on its ethical side emphasizes the principle of service. If this principle were really believed in, it is impossible to conceive that our present chaotic condition of industry could exist. The fact that industry does not function effectively is of the most serious importance to the whole community.

What, then, is the real function of industry? Surely to provide the commodities and services necessary for the life of the community. Judged by this standard, industry is failing to fulfil its purpose. If tested by the tacitly accepted standard, that its purpose is to provide profit for the entrepreneur and wages for the employee, it is also a failure, for profit and wages are often not forthcoming. If we accept the principle of the real function of industry, we must admit that the system never has fulfilled the purpose for which so important a human activity exists, and never will until organized with a definite social purpose in view. The real trouble is that the system has not been organized at all, but has simply grown, without conscious principle or plan. It is true that employers and workmen have realized the necessity for organization, but only for immediately selfish ends—the protection of group interests, with no regard for the larger interests of the community. This must necessarily be the case so long as the motive underlying industrial effort is selfish, and therefore unsocial. Thus we see federations of employers and workers' trade unions definitely formulating policies intended to restrict output. None of the parties will admit this, but, as we shall see later, the results are there, and we are wisely advised to judge trees by their fruits.

Along with the activities of industry (the producer) and commerce (the distributor) we must always bear in mind the whole community (the consumer).

It is a startling anomaly that, in all the factors hitherto regarded as essential to production, the world was never so well equipped for providing the things people need in order to live as now. Nature is as generous as ever she was in providing her share of these essential things. In fact, there is practically no limit to her generosity except that of man's inability, through lack of knowledge or desire, to draw upon it. Science has never been allowed

to render her best service to mankind because it would often have been inimical to selfish, vested interests. The full application of invention to industrial purposes has been thwarted by employer and employee alike. The present mechanical facilities for production are capable of providing immensely greater quantities of goods than the world has yet received, yet the process of production is frequently restricted because it does not pay to work continuously. The people required to operate this vast machinery are there, willing, and indeed anxious, to be employed in producing the needed commodities. On the other hand, there are the peoples of the earth, many of them in the direst need of food, clothing and shelter —the elementary material requirements of life. One other material factor remains. Under existing conditions, credit and finance are said to be the life-blood of trade; and with industry and commerce in such an unsatisfactory condition, it is necessary that this factor should be considered from the same point of view as all the other essential social activities, that of the common good.

All the hitherto essential factors of production are thus seen to be present. What, then, is lacking?

It has been pointed out already that our present system has grown, and not been organized. In a simpler state of society, when men were not so numerous and lived in closer contact with nature, their wants were fewer, and the evils of the system were not so evident. Now that society is much more complex, the need for organization for the common good has become a pressing problem. At present the livelihood of millions of our fellows depends on their being able to secure employment. But if our industrial system develops on its present lines, manual labour will become less and less necessary as mechanical appliances become more perfect. The logical outcome is that a growing number of people will be unemployed, and, unless provided for in some other way, will starve. Our social order does not take all the implications inherent in the industrial system into account. We simply cannot face the logical outcome; and as it is not good for man to be idle, and we cannot allow him to starve, we shall be compelled to solve the problem of organizing industrial effort so as to provide the means and opportunity for a full life for all.

If we examine some of the criticisms of our present system already advanced, we find that the operation of the motive of immediate self-interest stands directly across the path of increased production of commodities. Employers are loud in their demand that labour should increase production. But employers and traders have often deliberately conspired to restrict supplies in order to maintain profits. Quite recently Australian wool-growers have deplored the necessity for shearing sheep. American farmers have burnt their corn rather than let it come into the market, and have

deliberately restricted the growth of cotton. Fish have been thrown back into the sea after men have rendered arduous service and risked their lives in catching them. Cotton mills must go on short time. And all the time people are starving and dying for want of food and clothing. To such a pass has our present system brought us. On the other hand, labour is afraid that if it exerted itself to the fullest extent it would find itself unemployed and starving in its turn, while in many directions a growing disinclination to assist in the process of private profit-making is evident. Hence "ca'-canny" is practised and the most rigid precautions taken in all well-organized industries to prevent augmentation of the supply of labour. As long as income depends on employment this will be the case, and few people are in a position to criticize with any degree of consistency.

The present aggravated position has been attributed to the war. Undoubtedly the war has had something to do with it. But it has simply accelerated matters. The whole trend of industrial development has for years been towards chaos, and prior to the war we had the regularly recurring phenomena of periods of so-called overproduction (really of under-consumption) and consequent unemployment. If reorganization on the basis of function cannot be brought about, there seems to be nothing before us but the violent collapse of our present civilization; but to thoughtful people there is a better alternative, and one that especially concerns the people who call themselves Christians.

Reference has been made to the fact that our industrial system has simply happened, and is not the product of any definite social plan. The industrial revolution brought about an enormously rapid material change which was not accompanied by the moral and spiritual adjustments that were necessary if the evil effects which have resulted were to be avoided. A body of economic doctrine was evolved, the purpose of which was to justify certain practices which had developed with the new methods of production. The first great challenge of the system and its advocates came from the Christian Socialists and from John Ruskin. Its substance found the fullest expression in Ruskin's *Unto this Last*, though he deals with phases of the subject in all his later writings. He says:—

> Nothing in history had ever been so disgraceful to human intellect as the acceptance among us of the common doctrines of political economy as a science. I have many grounds for saying this, but one of the chief may be given in a few words. I know no previous instance in history of a nation's establishing a systematic disobedience to the first principles of its professed religion. The writings which we (verbally) esteem as divine not only denounce the love of money as the source of all evil, and as an idolatry abhorred of the Deity, but declare mammon service to be

the accurate and irreconcilable opposite of God's service; and whenever they speak of riches absolute, and poverty absolute, declare woe to the rich and blessing to the poor. Whereupon we forthwith investigate a science of becoming rich as the shortest road to national prosperity.

In all this the Christian Church seems to have played the part of a good second to the economists, for it has never formulated any definite attitude towards the industrial practices so forcibly challenged by Ruskin. It has taken the whole industrial and social order for granted, enjoining patience upon the victims, and holding out the hope of compensation hereafter for the hardships inflicted upon them here. Generally, the people who became rich under the system were lay–pillars of the Church, and derived great comfort from the doctrine that in some way their riches were the direct reward of moral and spiritual deserts. These people, and the Church too, imagined that if they gave alms to the poor they had discharged all the obligations that religion laid upon them. It never occurred to either party that a system which produced such unbrotherly effects was inherently wrong.

Partly as a result of the teaching of Ruskin and others, but more directly as the result of more widely disseminated education, many people are now challenging the very fundamentals of the industrial system, and, fortunately, the Church is slowly being roused to the truth. The tree is being judged by its fruits, and it is being more and more realized that the system itself is wrong and must be abolished. It is wrong because it has failed, and is still more likely to fail, to provide the community with the means of life. It is wrong because it puts a premium on the selfish instincts, and to that extent suppresses the play of the generous motives which the Christian religion commends.

This brings one to the much debated question whether the ethics and spirit of Christ's teaching are capable of being applied in industrial affairs. A growing number of people believe they are. Most of them do not use the terminology of Christianity, but they are convinced of the injustice which exists in the maldistribution of the material wealth that is produced, with the consequent inequality of opportunity to live in any really worthy sense. Some of the remedies put forward are naturally denounced by all the interests which are concerned with maintaining the present state of things; but this should not deter fair-minded persons from examining such proposals. The essential point in their criticisms is that the present order is anti-social in its results, and therefore is inherently wrong. This point of view can no longer be ignored by anyone, especially the Christian Church, which, as the representative of Christ in the world, is peculiarly concerned. It can no longer stand aside on the plea that this is an economic and

political question. It is impossible to separate the business of life into watertight compartments in this way, or to have varying standards of moral conduct. The question is pre-eminently a moral one, and as such is of vital concern to all Christians. The economic and political aspects of the problem must be adjusted to the moral principles which should govern all social relationships, and our failure to realize this is responsible for the evil position in which we find ourselves.

The question naturally arises as to what practical steps can be taken to organize industry so that, without let or hindrance, it may really produce and distribute its products as and where required. In approaching the problem we need to rid our minds of prejudice as far as this is possible, and consider it with the one idea of social service in view. The most far-reaching proposals have been put forward by the Socialists, who would have all the instruments of production and distribution owned and administered by the community, either through the State or through the municipality. Its doctrinaire advocates still hold this idea ; but of late years this solution has been materially discounted in the minds of many previously favourably inclined to it. Under conditions created by the war, it has been recognized that the two conflicting principles of liberty and authority have somehow yet to be reconciled, and that liberty, or scope for individual initiative, is likely to be impeded under collectivist administration. There are other difficulties due to the varying nature and conditions of different industries. Some industries are fairly compact in organization and administration, while others are widely scattered and loose in organization. Some are almost entirely mechanical, while others are still really handicrafts operated on a very small scale.

Probably the principle of nationalization could immediately be applied to the mining industry and the railway service, which are rapidly approaching the monopolistic stage. There are other industries, however, where the collectivist solution does not seem possible, in the near future at any rate. It does not follow, however, that the principle of social service cannot be applied to them. Its application on these lines would not be acceptable to the extremists in either direction, but we have to consider the practicability of any experiments that are suggested. In the building industry what is called a Building Guild has been formed, which has set out to give service at, or about, cost. It is being faced with the inevitable difficulties due to a capitalist environment, and appears to be handicapped by the fact that there is a shortage of administrative ability as well as of capital. While, nominally, there is nothing to prevent employers, or the best-paid technicians, from taking part in the work of the Guild, they are not likely to do so. Admirable as the Guild constitution is in many ways, it does not

really furnish an opportunity for the development of a whole industry, and the solution of this problem may have to be sought in other directions. It may take the form of regulated private enterprise, but the regulation would need to be devised and applied by the people in the industry, and not imposed by the State, which has quite enough to do in other spheres.

Proposals for such a reorganization of the building industry were formulated by a committee of the Building Trades' Joint Council a few years ago, and finally submitted to the Council in November 1920. Though the Report met with approval from the operative members of the Council, and from students of economics and industrial history in many parts of the world, the employer members of the Council would not consider it. The fact of its origin within the Council has been the main factor in deciding the employers to withdraw from membership, and thus bring about the break-up of what seemed to be the most promising of the Industrial Councils set up under the Whitley Report. That, however, is not the last word in the matter, for the idea is still very much alive in the minds of the operatives and of many others who are honestly seeking a way out of an apparent impasse.

The Report referred to originated when a committee was appointed to "consider and report upon the question of Scientific Management and Reduction of Costs, with a view to enabling the Building Industry to render the most efficient service possible." Inquiry into facts soon brought out three reasons why the workman did not care to exert himself as much as his critics seemed to expect of him, viz. :—

1. Fear of unemployment.
2. The disinclination to make unrestricted profit for a private employer.
3. Lack of interest owing to non-participation in control.

A fourth reason why the industry was not as effective as it might be appeared, i.e. "inefficiency, both managerial and operative," and as a result of this diagnosis proposals were made with a view to remedying the situation.

All the proposed reorganization and future administration was to be carried out by Joint Councils and committees, working on national and local bases. This would furnish an outlet for self-expression on the part of the operative, such as has not yet been open to him.

To meet the fear of unemployment bogey, proposals for regularizing the flow of work were put forward ; but recognizing that, though this might lessen the possibility of unemployment, it would not remove it, a scheme for the maintenance of unemployed

members was outlined, the cost to be borne by the industry as part of the cost of its service.

Useful suggestions were also put forward for the better organization of work in workshops and on buildings in course of erection. While these proposals were under discussion, very practical help was given by the employee members of the committee, proving that, given the opportunity, they are capable of very materially contributing to the improvement of the industry.

The most difficult part of the committee's task was that dealing with the objection to private profit, for here restraint was placed upon the liberty of the employer, as now understood. It was realized that in the building industry the employer is almost invariably the manager of the business as well as owner of the capital. The Report proposed that as owner he was entitled to an agreed, fixed rate of interest for the use of his capital, which should be guaranteed as long as the business continued to be efficiently conducted. As manager he was to receive a salary for service rendered, on the same principle as every other worker received pay, and suggestions were made for fixing salaries on a satisfactory basis. In addition, if capital losses were sustained under certain conditions, the owner was to be compensated out of surplus funds. When surplus funds accrued, they were to be held in trust for various objects, chief among which were research and technical improvement, with a view to improving the whole service.

Employer members of the Council failed to realize that the term "scientific management" is capable of a much wider interpretation than that usually given to it. In reality, it must take into account the factor of human nature as capable of being influenced by far better and more effective motives than mere selfish acquisitiveness. It was assumed that, given a large measure of security, together with the limitation of profit on the one hand, and on the other a full recognition of the employer as a valuable co-worker in the public service, the main causes of slackness on the part of the workman would be removed. The signatories of the Report were of opinion that the more human conditions which it envisaged would make possible an increased output of from 30 to 50 per cent., and this is where the benefit to the public would accrue.

The Report contained many details which cannot be elaborated here, where only a brief outline is possible. It does not purport to be a panacea for all our industrial ills, but is simply a scheme for dealing with the needs and conditions of a particular industry. It has been ranked by Mr. R. H. Tawney,[1] along with the Sankey Report for the mining industry, as offering a possible line of solution in some directions, and is put forward here to that end.

[1] See *The Acquisitive Society*, 124 ff.

Material organization is necessary, and useful up to a point, but it is only a part of the solution of our problem. Many industries are now well organized for production, but the best are capable of improvement. The greatest need is to secure the interest and willing service of all who are engaged in industry. Events have shown that the old incentives are no longer effective, and that new and better ones must be found. The only finally effective one must appeal to what Ruskin described as the "human affections"; these must be brought into play if industry is to render the whole service which the community needs.

What other way can there be than the application of the principles so clearly laid down in the New Testament? The whole burden of Christ's social teaching was service. He repeatedly denounced the sin of avarice, and quite as clearly showed how true riches were to be obtained. But has the Church as the exponent of Christ's message ever really believed these things? Apparently not. If it had, its members at least would have been trained to apply the principle and spirit of service in every walk of life, in which case there would be no question of industrial chaos. That this is the only solution has been partially proved over and over again. Men try, in all sorts of ways, to make shift with the existing order of things, and it is only rendered tolerable to the degree in which readjustments move in the direction indicated. Why not, therefore, the business men of the Christian Church, employers and workmen, meet in conference, together with the clergy, and students of industrial history and economics, and seek to solve this most vital and pressing of social problems? It would be necessary that they should come together in the spirit of earnest inquiry, the true scientific spirit, resolved that no old prejudices should be allowed to hamper the search for truth. The findings of such a conference would furnish an industrial policy which the Church could advocate and insist upon; and at last the sheep, which are looking to the Church as the shepherd, would be led along the only path which is safe, and in a direction which is really progress.

THOMAS FOSTER.

A YOUNG CONGREGATIONALIST TO YOUNG CONGREGATIONALISTS

When Dr. Fairbairn was Principal of Airedale, he frequently met gatherings of working men in Bradford for interchange of views and discussion. On many such occasions some enthusiast with a short cut to the millennium would press his ideas on the Doctor, to be met by the question, " What do you mean by so-and-so ? Define your terrrrms." Very often the poor man would have to spend the rest of the evening in exact definition of the terms he had employed !

Therefore—" What is a *young* Congregationalist ? " It is the more necessary to ask this question because not long ago one of our religious weeklies referred to a Congregationalist approaching sixty as one of the " coming young men " of the denomination ! This article is addressed particularly to those belonging to our Churches who are under thirty-five, or about it, or who are akin to them in spirit.

* * *

The world to-day reminds one of nothing so much as the condition of a May week boat-race crew after a terrific struggle to escape a bump. Tremendous energy has been expended, and men have fallen on their oars utterly exhausted. After an interval they will again rise, bend to work, and paddle to their college barge ; but for the moment they are " done."

Even so have the young people of this country seemed during the last three or four years. A great and surprising outburst of moral idealism has been followed by reaction, and now youth seems to desire nothing but to eat, drink and be merry, to play tennis all summer and dance all winter, letting others do anything they will for them or for the world, while they simply enjoy !

In every department of life the same story is told. Politicians have deplored it daily during the election ; Trade Union officials emphasize it continually, as do those interested in Universities, local government, and humanitarian effort. From all sides comes the cry that young people simply will not come forward to take their part in social and educational work, in political propaganda, or in administrative tasks.

* * *

The interval has lasted long enough. The call comes to be up and doing, all the more so because we are in the unfortunate position of " sandwich boat," and have to row again almost immediately.

The world after the war is still in perplexity and misery, almost

in despair, and its hope lies in the young. Are we afraid because God has matched us with this hour, or do we rejoice because of its glorious opportunity? Two aspects of the call to the young are worthy of the consideration of young Congregationalists—the national (international, if you will) and the denominational.

1. *The destiny of the world turns on the attitude of its youth to the present call.*

We have entered on our inheritance, and find the estates mortgaged as much as they will bear. We assumed we should receive an income sufficient to live upon, and find instead that what we already possess must be risked to save the rest. The fights our fathers thought they had won have to be fought over again. We know now that the spread of education will not keep the world at peace; on every side are individuals, classes and nations that believe in force, strife and war. Our so-called Christian country is inhabited by pagans, who know nothing of the Bible, who do not think of religion as a real thing, who never worship and rarely pray.

Such is our heritage and our task, and we must set to work. It is no good bewailing the past, and cursing the "old men" for the world they have made, as do so many of our younger poets. Rather must we recognize that the desperate situation can only be met by renewed consecration and sustained effort on our part. What can keep the world at peace as effectively as the witness of young men who themselves have known war in all its bloody horror? It is their business to be training little children, in home and school, to hate war with every fibre of their being.

We must be ready to combine the energy and adventure, the enthusiasm and zeal, of youth with the experience and wisdom of age. Youth must do the things that age knows and cannot do; neither can save the world alone.

A story of the Prince of Wales—probably familiar by this time, and certainly good enough to be true—relates that on his American trip his medical adviser became anxious about his jaded appearance. Knowing that the Prince was unlikely to accede to a request that he should retire early from a dance, the doctor spoke to the orchestra, and said, "I want to get the Prince to bed early to-night. At midnight will you please play the National Anthem?" The orchestra did as requested, and when the last strains of "God Save the King" died away, the Prince jumped on a chair and said, "Now we've put father to bed, we'll begin!"

Now, we have no wish to "put father to bed," but *we must begin.* We do not despise the accumulated wisdom of the past, but we must build on it; we must employ it in business, not live on it as capital. The more difficult the situation, the more eager should we be; the greater the adventure, the more we should thrill at being called

to have a share in it. Are we affrighted because youth's task is so great? We need not be when we remember that Christianity is a young man's religion, and that many of the mightiest movements the world has known have been inspired by young people. Jesus was little more than thirty when He died on Calvary, but He had revealed God to man for all time as Father of Love. Mary, who bore Him, was a village maiden, and the disciples band was made up of young men.

Francis was twenty-seven when he took poverty for his bride, and Luther thirty-four when he defied the Pope in his ninety-five Theses. Calvin was only twenty-six when he wrote the *Institutes*, the book which has done more than any other, save the Bible, to change human history and the destinies of men and of nations. Protestantism in this country really began with groups of undergraduates at Cambridge, and the Methodist revival with the "Holy Club" in Oxford. Carey was only twenty-four when he heard the call to India, and Henry Martyn only thirty-one when he died.

But why need we look for examples beyond our own denomination? When the New Testament idea of the Church was re-discovered in Elizabeth's reign it was by young men. Browne and Harrison were scarcely in the thirties, and when they laid down their lives, Barrowe, Greenwood, and Penry were little older. A generation later the Plymouth Colony was established almost entirely by young men—not middle-aged, as their bearded faces have inclined us to think. William Bradford was only eighteen when he walked ten miles to service each Sunday, and but thirty-one when he was called to lead the little Colony he ruled so well. When youth—Congregational youth—has done so well in the past, need we fear, except lest we be unworthy of our sires?

2. *One of the first tasks of young Congregationalists is to help Congregationalism.*

In recent years our denomination has more and more realized the need and the importance of youth. Organized work for young people has been developed; young men have appeared on the platform of our Assemblies and in our committees (though the average age of delegates to the Union is still far too high), and the excellent plan of welcoming newly ordained ministers at the May Assembly has been adopted. Young people, in return, can help Congregationalism in two ways:

(*a*) They can back the Forward Movement to the last ounce of their energy. Granted that the denomination ought long ago to have tackled the objects for which the £500,000 is being raised! Granted that this is a debt the last generation and the one before it have passed on to us, and that ministers

should have had retiring allowances, their widows protection, and their children education ever since the Congregational Union was organized! Still, it is no good crying over spilt milk. It is our privilege to make up the leeway, and the enthusiasm and sacrifice of young people in every church and school are needed.

In like manner should keen young business men get to work, and discover and proclaim the scandalous way in which Congregationalists have treated their central office, telling them that the present state of things cannot and must not go on. Year after year the Churches have been increasing their demands on the office while their contributions have remained stationary. *Young men* must see that the Churches put their central organization on a real business footing.

If the Forward Movement succeeds, fetters that bind the denomination will be struck off and the Churches be made effective for the doing of the Master's work.

(*b*) They can give us a vision of Congregationalism as it might be, and save us from settling down for ever to routine and formality. For example, let us set out a dream we sometimes dream, in which the Memorial Hall becomes a real centre of Congregational life and activity.

A magic wand is waved, and the building is at once transformed and transfigured. May we describe it when the dream comes true?

From top to bottom the Memorial Hall is a Congregational building. All "outsiders" have been removed; the L.M.S. has been brought back from the Westminster stables, and housed in a Congregational home; there is one book-room, and not two. In that home, the permanent secretariat—Home, Colonial, Foreign, Young People, Temperance, Social Service, Women, Literature, Finance—is a Cabinet, meeting regularly, and giving the Churches ideas and a policy, and making Congregationalists realize what they can and ought to do for the world.

Part of the building has become a social centre, where visitors from abroad and from the provinces can meet and have a "Congregational chop," a "Congregational coffee," or a game of chess. The Manchester Congregational Church House has been visited, and useful hints in this direction picked up.

The Congregational Library, on which, be it said to our shame, not a penny has been spent on books for several years, has come to life again. It is the "Mudie's" and the "Dr. Williams's" for Congregationalists, and ministers, in the country especially, find it a great boon.

The Congregational Publication Department has become a credit and a strength to the denomination. No longer are its profits seized to make good deficiencies in the contributions of the Churches to

the Union, but they are employed in literary enterprise. The success of the publication work of the Student Christian Movement has been both a rebuke and an inspiration, and we have profited thereby. We still extol our forefathers, but no longer give other Churches the right to point out that we have never reprinted their works; the writings of Browne, Barrowe, Greenwood and Penry have been made available for all. From this united Congregational Publishing House, free to work in its proper sphere, a constant stream of literature flows out to the Churches and to the world, carrying with it education and blessing. Congregationalism is no longer ashamed of its literary representation, and in addition to the QUARTERLY is a weekly, which has a message and is not concerned merely with coming young Congregationalists of sixty or thereabouts!

Such is the dream. It is for young Congregationalists to dream dreams like this, and then make them come true. Congregationalism, like the world, is passing through its period of stress and difficulty, but through the zeal and devotion of youth both will come out triumphant.

When, toward the end of the fifteenth century, Bartholomew Diaz was carried by storms round the southern extremity of the African continent and along its eastern coast, he named the great headland "The Cape of Storms." His monarch, wiser than he, looked beyond the Cape to the promise of new realms beyond, and said, "Nay, not the 'Cape of Storms.' We'll call it 'The Cape of Good Hope.'" If young Congregationalists can have the like vision, these years of strain and effort will be, for the denomination to which they belong and for the world, a "Cape of Good Hope."

EDITOR.

NONCONFORMITY AT THE UNIVERSITIES

I. OXFORD

It is difficult to realize that the history of Nonconformity at the older Universities is of very recent date, and that it all falls within the memory of those now living. It is true that for a brief period at the close of the Commonwealth Congregationalism was established in the high places of Oxford; as when John Owen was Dean of Christ Church and Vice-Chancellor of the University, and Thomas Goodwin was President of Magdalen and formed there a Congregational Church. The Restoration, however, soon put an end to this condition of things, and, in the reaction that followed, Oxford was given over for many years to a type of Anglicanism which regarded dissent as anathema. It was not until the repeal of the Test Acts in 1870 that Nonconformists were allowed to enter the University without abjuring their faith. Once it was possible to do so, they soon began to make use of their privileges, and ten years after the repeal of the tests some thirty of them were to be found scattered among the different colleges. It was, perhaps, natural that they should have gone at first in greater numbers to Cambridge, but those who went to Oxford had, as a rule, no reason to regret doing so. For a time their presence was resented in some quarters, and one or two of them had uncomfortable experiences at the hands of undergraduates. Such feeling, however, soon died down, and from about 1880 onwards they have continued to grow in numbers and to take their full part in college and University life.

In 1881 a society called the Nonconformist Union was founded, with the following objects:—

(1) To remove the feeling of isolation among Nonconformist undergraduates.

(2) By means of discussions, lectures and meetings to investigate the principles and *raison d'être* of English Nonconformity.

(3) To present a free and simple doctrine of Christianity to members of the Union and others in such a way as to help those who are in perplexity or doubt as to the fundamentals of religion.

(4) To establish if possible and desired a Sunday Greek Testament or Bible Class which may assist the religious life of all, especially of those who intend to enter the ministry.

(5) To present to members of the Established Church the true meaning and aim of Nonconformity.

The leading spirit in the formation of this Union was Mr. R. F. Horton, then Fellow of New College, and its first secretary was Mr. Joseph King, then an undergraduate of Trinity. Among its

earliest members were F. W. Newland, W. J. Ashley, T. E. Ellis, and W. Ryland Adkins. Its President was Professor Bryce, and its Vice-Presidents were Professor T. H. Green, of Balliol, and Professor James Legg. The society did some very useful work. For a number of years it formed a rallying point for Nonconformists within the University, and by arranging for the visits of Nonconformist ministers from the outside helped to keep those within the University in touch with the Free Churches throughout the country. From time to time it arranged lectures and sermons, and enlisted the services for this purpose of men like Dr. Dale, Dr. Fairbairn, Dr. Richard Glover, Dr. Conder, Judge Willis, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, and many others. The society owed much to its President, the late Lord Bryce. He did not content himself with appearing on special occasions, but attended the ordinary meetings when he was in Oxford, and contributed not a little to their interest and stimulus.

It must be admitted, however, that the society did not altogether succeed in its objects. Perhaps the best evidence of this is to be found in a letter written by one of its Vice-Presidents, Professor T. H. Green, to Dr. Dale shortly after it was founded. Professor Green wrote :—

> The opening of the national Universities to Nonconformists has been in my judgment an injury rather than a help to Nonconformity. You are sending up here year after year the sons of your best and wealthiest families. They are often altogether uninfluenced by the services of the Churches which they find here, and they not only drift away from Nonconformity, they drift away and lose all faith ; and you are bound as soon as you have secured the opening of the University for your sons to follow them when you send them here in order to defend and maintain their religious life.

In consequence partly of this appeal, and partly of the difficulties of the situation within the University itself, Nonconformists outside Oxford now began to consider whether anything could be done to help and foster Free Church life in Oxford. At first it was hoped that this might be accomplished through the town Churches, and proposals were mooted for founding a sort of Nonconformist chaplaincy in connexion with one of them. It was generally understood that such a chaplaincy would in the first instance be offered to Mr. Horton of New College. Nothing, however, came of it, for at that time the Free Churches in Oxford were not disposed to identify themselves with any University movement. They had their own battle to fight, and they were doing good work in their own way ; and, while very willing to welcome members of the University to their services, they naturally regarded them as at best only temporary adherents. It should be said, perhaps, that the relations between the town Churches and the University have never

been as close and intimate in Oxford as in Cambridge. The blame for this most probably may be pretty evenly distributed. When, therefore, the negotiations above referred to came to nothing, the minds of Congregationalists outside Oxford turned to the plan of founding a theological college within the precincts of the University, and after much thought and discussion it was arranged to transfer Spring Hill College from Birmingham to Oxford, and establish it there under the name of Mansfield and the leadership of Dr. Fairbairn. Dr. Fairbairn went to Oxford in 1886, and began work with half a dozen students in some temporary premises. Three years later the college buildings were completed and opened, and from that time forward Mansfield College has been a centre of life and activity for thé Free Churchmen at the University. The Nonconformist Union then ceased to be, and its work was taken on partly by the College, partly by the Milton Club, and afterwards by the Livingstone Society. The College chapel services from the first have been largely attended by undergraduates, both men and women, and after a time a chaplain was appointed with the special object of caring for their interests and organizing work among them. For some time past this had been well done by the Wesleyans connected with the town Churches for members of their own body, and shortly before the war the Presbyterians also established a chaplaincy to care for the Scottish students who were now coming to Oxford in increasing numbers. This resulted ultimately in the erection of a Presbyterian chapel in Alfred Street. About the time that the Mansfield buildings were opened, Manchester New College was transferred from Gordon Square to Oxford, and entered upon its permanent habitation in Mansfield Road in 1893. It was dedicated to truth, to liberty, and to religion, and has contributed not a little to the growth of a more liberal, religious and theological spirit in Oxford.

This pastoral work, however, represents only one aspect of the Free Church witness in Oxford. The repeal of the Test Acts left Nonconformists in the University still under considerable disabilities They were not able to take any part in the theological work of the University, and degrees in theology were entirely closed to them. When it was proposed, at the instigation of Dr. Jowett of Balliol, that Mr. Horton should be appointed examiner in what was then known as the rudiments of faith and religion, there was the most violent opposition, and the proposal was thrown out by an overwhelming majority. This, however, was at that time an altogether premature step, and opinion was certainly not ripe for any drastic change of the kind. But the work which Dr. Fairbairn and his colleagues were doing at Mansfield gradually brought about a new state of things. The standard of scholarship at Mansfield was always very high, and almost every year one or more of the theological

prizes or scholarships in the University were won by Mansfield men. The time soon came when it was felt to be an anomaly that distinguished teachers in institutions like Mansfield and Manchester should be altogether outside the theological work of the University. The change came quietly and swiftly. For some time past now members of both colleges have taken their share in the work of the Theological Board ; the college lectures form part of the theological curriculum of the University ; and the opposition to opening theological degrees to non-Anglicans has entirely disappeared. They can now compete with others, not only for the Arts degree in theology, but also for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity and ultimately for that of Doctor of Divinity. The change was marked by the conferment of the D.D. degree by decree of Convocation on the present Principal of Mansfield, and of the honorary doctorate on several Nonconformist scholars. Experience has abundantly shown that it is possible for Anglicans and Nonconformists of all kinds to work together in the interests of theological education without in any sense abandoning any of their convictions. The Theological School at Oxford, under the guidance of the present Regius Professor, bids fair to become the best and most comprehensive in the United Kingdom. Men of all shades of opinion co-operate in its service, and there can be no doubt that it has gained rather than lost by opening its doors so freely. One disability yet remains. The theological professorships in the University are still confined to ordained members of the Anglican Church. But, as they are in most cases connected with canonries, the disestablishment of the Church would have to come about before they could be thrown open. It is perhaps not too much to say that even for this change the way is being gradually prepared.

One of the most powerful religious influences in Oxford of recent years has been the Student Christian Movement. In the work of this movement Nonconformist undergraduates have taken their full share, and its leaders have often been found in their ranks. Here they have met for prayer, conference, and Christian service on an equal footing with Anglicans, and nothing has done more to bring about a better mutual understanding and relationship. The intercourse thus made possible is gradually creating a new atmosphere which will lead in time to the only kind of Christian union worth having. Even when this comes about Free Churchmen will still have their contribution to make to the religious life of the country. Oxford is a strategical point for their witness, and it may be said, without hesitation, that they are now making good use of the opportunity it presents.

W. B Selbie.

In religion they belonged to the most cultured and intellectual form of English Nonconformity, the Independent body, which—avoiding alike the poetry and symbolism of Anglicanism on the one hand, and the familiarity and homeliness of Methodism on the other—founds its faith on the workings of reason rather than on the beauty of ritualism or the excitement of revivalism, and worships with its intelligence rather than with its emotions. Too cold a spiritual home, perchance, for the artistic temperament, which hungers and thirsts for that other side of the breastplate of Righteousness which men call Beauty; but a fine school for all those who inherit the stern spirit of their Puritan ancestors, and who are of one flesh with the men who fought for religious freedom at Naseby and Sedgemoor.

Ellen Thorneycroft Fowler.

* * *

The exclusion of Noncomformists from Oxford and Cambridge tended to bar out their ablest men from the higher professional and political life of the age. This had the effect of supplying the Dissenting bodies with men of a very high type as preachers and leaders—able men embittered by a sense of ill-usage and ostracism. It is only since Oxford and Cambridge have been thrown open to all creeds that men who would formerly have been the leaders of a militant Nonconformity have been absorbed in the general stream of national life. This change has contributed with other causes to the diminution of the Dissenting bodies both in self-consciousness and power.

G. M. Trevelyan, *Brit. Hist. in the XIXth Century.*

* * *

The scholarship was given, not to a youth of brilliant personality, but to "a short-sighted tubby lad from North Wales. He went to college next term, and since he had not one single original thought in his head, and rarely said anything which had not been said by someone else before him, he was a great success when he entered the ministry, and finally rose to well-deserved eminence upon the administrative council of his denomination."

From one of Miss M. Morgan Gibbon's novels.

* * *

Although Henry's mother was an invalid, she had a moral, religious and intellectual influence over her family that cannot

be exaggerated. She was a profound reader and a brilliant talker, and belonged to what was in those days called orthodox nonconformity, or Congregationalism.

MRS. ASQUITH.

[IGNORANCE of what the Free Churches stand for is often displayed by public men and women, but rarely so completely as by Dr. Ethel Smyth in her *Impressions That Remained.* Mrs. Benson (Archbishop Benson's wife) "was an upholder, and sometimes a holder, of informal prayer meetings. Extemporary prayer is, as we know, *part of the Presbyterian scheme;* but firstly the ministers are trained to it, which takes away what I cannot but feel as the offensiveness of the thing, and secondly, the training sometimes results in a Dr. MacGregor. But it is quite another matter when *the performer is an amateur. . . .*"] The italics are ours!

* * *

IT is a little disconcerting to note the prevalence and the persistence of the supposition that the Churches in apostolic and sub-apostolic days were independent congregational entities, none of them being responsible to any outside authority for its doctrine or polity. Dr. Garvie, in his admirable paper on Congregationalism, seems to lend countenance to this when he speaks of the "absolute autonomy of the local congregation" as being a "literal imitation of the apostolic Churches." On the other hand, he quotes and endorses Sohm, whose verdict, of course, looks in precisely the opposite direction.

It is too often assumed as axiomatic that this total independence of the local congregations in doctrine and polity has the support of the New Testament and the practice of the sub-apostolic age. Possibly it is this, in part, which draws from Dr. Henson his caustic allusion to the "improvised polities (of some Christian bodies) based on ill-understood texts from the Bible." The fact is, of course, that the witness of the Early Church, in documents and in practice, is wholly on the other side. . . . But the essential thing about the Early Church and the early Churches is that the latter regarded themselves as locally representative of the former. The Churches were not self-contained spiritual entities, but members of one Body, in organic connexion with one another, holding the same doctrine, acknowledging the same authority, living the same life. The notion of a group-Church, existing to emphasize some particular aspect of the faith, or some particular form of polity, and claiming an equal status with the Mother Church, was unknown and undreamt of for centuries.

THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH on "The Catholicism of the Future," in the *Church Quarterly Review,* October 1922.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose. The first paper is printed as a not inappropriate introduction to the section.

THE CHANGING WORLD

If any doleful consoler tells us that we live in a changing world, we turn away with an air of languid boredom. It is certainly true, but it is not new; and, as a statement standing alone, it illuminates few dark horizons. Most of us, especially after we have reached the statically comfortable age of forty-five—beyond which business managers and Church deacons compel us to think wistfully of powerful hair-restorers—long for some changeless Rock of Ages rather than for the shifting sand of a mutable universe. The fact that things and manners change confronts us at every street corner and shrieks at us every time we try to estimate our bank balance. Bergson has unveiled a life force that changes its form and direction at every moment; Einstein has transformed our assured conception of a universe that is illimitable into a puzzled belief that the universe is at one and the same time unlimited *and* finite; Bernard Shaw is a prophet in the wilderness trying to persuade us to change the three-score-years-and-ten of the Psalmist into the glorious three hundred weary years of his *blasé* Tertians; Robert Blatchford has abandoned his crude creed of deterministic materialism for the cruder creed that matter is built up of spiritual constituents; and, to crown all, the Lord Rector of St. Andrew's University has dealt a shattering blow at our assured belief that our personality is one and indivisible by telling us that he is at one and the same moment Mr. M'Connachie and Sir J. M. Barrie. Any man who cannot perceive that we live in a time of change must be a kind of æolian harp that no high wind can touch to music. Even the most obtuse will notice the mutability of our

times before long, for gramophone records that will growl and whirr for three long hours will soon be his portion, and the broadcasting wireless of the evening will leave him little time to think of the business arrangements of the morning.

One only wishes that all these interminable changes were invariably accompanied by human betterment. So far as one can see, however, many of our scientific transformations are not divorced from an increase in human woe. Mr. H. G. Wells was so distressed by the havoc caused on earth by his highly scientific Martians that he killed them by a microbe. The world grew so sick of the marvellous changes wrought by Teutonic supermen that it transformed them into sullen and indignant under-dogs. The substitution of the motor-car for the old stage coach has largely increased the motorist's obesity and the pedestrian's blasphemy. The flying machine has created a longing for a large place that is not at all like the Psalmist's. And sometimes one is tempted to think—without wailing like a pessimist—that the tendency to inner change, called being *born again*, must make haste lest it be left far behind by external transformation. Many of the ancient alchemists spent precious hours attempting to transmute the elements of ordinary matter into gold. Their failure has not discouraged their modern successors. But although the moderns have succeeded where the ancients failed, the tragic fact is that they have only succeeded in transmuting the elements into *lead*. What a tragedy it would be if, owing to our race's failure to change morally and spiritually as quickly as we are changing scientifically, many of our modern transmutations were to end in futility! When Mr. Wells made the scientific splendour of *The War in the Air* end in grass growing in the pavements of London he may well have scented the danger from afar.

The alternative to this dread possibility is a change of heart, soul and mind, as swift and constant as the ceaseless external mutability. If the soul stands still it is little use to quicken and ever quicken our rate of material transit. Man's increase in regenerated life must keep pace with science's accelerated speed. How is this to be done? One of the first necessities is a very old one—man must be born again! The old man must be scrapped to make way for the new one, just as the old bone-shaker was broken up to make a place for the modern motor-cycle. It is little good travelling at seventy miles an hour to London if we do not travel at the same speed towards Regeneration. A transformed external world must become the serene shrine for the converted worshipper. To this end history and experience teach us that more is needed than the patching up of superficial flaws. The whole man must be re-made. Experts in engineering know quite well that, in the old days of inadequate furnaces and rule-of-thumb methods, it

was no unusual thing for a great iron casting, the mould of which had required much labour to make, to be entirely spoilt for lack of a quart or two of molten metal. When this happened there were two possible alternative methods of repairing the flaw. The hole could be filled with lead—a method impossible if it were in a vital part—or the huge casting could be broken up and recast. The second expedient was often wisely adopted. The huge hammers smashed the imperfect casting to pieces, and the fragments were thrown back into the blazing furnace. A new mould was made, and ultimately a second casting emerged whole and complete. Ibsen (greatest of dramatists and novelists) perceived that this process must be paralleled in the human heart and mind and soul. His Peer Gynt is a queer, wayward creature in whose whimsical ambitions, vile sins and discreditable shifts and twistings many a modern man sees himself—except perhaps for the grace of God—as in a mirror. Peer Gynt, as the Button Moulder says, was "meant to be a gleaming button on the world's waistcoat, but your hoop was missing." He stole his neighbour's wife, ruined girls, trafficked in slaves, counteracted the influence of the idols he sent abroad by exporting missionaries also, broke every law of God, and ultimately returned to his native land a poor and disillusioned old man. Then the Button Moulder met him. "Here are my orders," he said. "You will fetch Peer Gynt. He has defied his destiny. He is a failure, and must go straight into the casting-ladle." That is simply the destiny and the hope of modern humanity. Into the casting-ladle! But not the casting-ladle of the Button Moulder's dreams. His idea is that the individual failure must be cast into the ladle to be merged once more in the mass. Christ's idea is that the individual sinner must be cast into the ladle so that he, retaining his identity, may be changed from glory unto glory. That is the chief change needed in this day of ceaseless mutability. A morally and spiritually unchanged man in a scientifically advancing world is only on the way to become an expert devil. When men tell us, therefore, with the light of triumph in their eyes, that science is quickly changing the whole material world, our paramount duty is quietly to ask: "Is Christ ceaselessly changing you—and me?"

HERBERT BROOK.

THE CHURCH MEETING AND REALITY

THE Christian Church arose not out of a theory, but out of an experience. The first disciples of Christ, in the days that followed the dread Passover, cleaving together under the compulsion of a common need and of a growing hope, discovered, in their unity of

heart and aim, the way to continued intercourse with their risen Lord.

Seemingly, explanations of the fact were attempted with reluctance. They did not seek to scrutinize too closely the "Presence" into which they came, but of the identity of their beloved Master they were sure. They were sure, too, that, in some mysterious but very real way, they entered into His company when they gathered together. Thus it was experience that made the doctrine of the Resurrection the basal theme of their evangel, and it was experience —the same experience—that made the "Fellowship of the Spirit" the controlling force in their actions. Of such local and visible fellowships were the first Churches formed, and in what remains to be written here the word "Church" is used to denote not the Kingdom of God catholic, or any denominational aggregation of Christians, but a particular group of believers among whom, by reason of their ability to gather together, this experience of Christ "in the midst" is or may be a reality.

For it may be laid down as an axiom, attested by centuries of widely varying outlook, that what has come to be called the "Real Presence" is an actual experience whenever men and women of one heart and one mind gather, with one accord, in one place (how the recorder emphasizes that unity!), "into the Name" of Jesus Christ. The Lord's Supper may be observed or not observed. The "Real Presence" belongs not to the mere "elements" of bread and wine. The Master's own words reveal that. The great Christian sacrament is the gathered Church itself, wherein the outward and visible signs are human believers, and the inward and spiritual grace is the special Presence of the Lord.

From that experience the Church took its rise, and in that experience won the marvellous triumphs of the first three centuries, when all the world was in opposition.

The light regard in which the membership of our Churches is held to-day by the world in general, and by the rising generation in particular, would seem to suggest that modern Congregationalism has reversed the old condition of affairs, and that it builds rather upon a theory than an experience. We press the text about the "two or three" into the service of public worship, for which it was never intended, or apply it to a sparse attendance at a weeknight service as a kind of forlorn hope, instead of taking it upon our lips with awe as a hallowed description of the most glorious experience of the soul. In dealing with the modern world in its hunger for immortality as a demonstrable fact, how many Church members can draw upon their experimental knowledge gained in Church Fellowship? In how many Church meetings does the overwhelming sense of the Divine Presence constitute an indisputable proof of the truth of the gospel? What value do Church members themselves

place upon their membership as a necessary element in their "salvation"?

The closing verses of the Second Gospel describe the marks of a real Church member. He casts out evil spirits, speaks with tongues, takes up serpents or drinks poison unscathed, heals the sick—all signs of power such as the world can see and appreciate. It is generally recognized that the verses in which this description of a Church member appears are a second-century addition to an otherwise incomplete Gospel. What seems to be recognized less generally is that these verses are far more tremendous in their implication as coming from the second century than from the first. For in the second century the Christian Churches had come to death-grips with the giant hosts of paganism. It is inconceivable that any sane editor would present the pagan world with such a list of operations, not as occasional happenings, but as the credentials of Churchmanship, unless the test could be met. If such signs as these were given as the marks of an authentic confession, there would appear to be no escape from the inference that the Churches could make good along those lines; and the extent of our lack to-day is immediately manifest. For on these terms Christianity spread with incredible rapidity, and the Churches were able to enforce a probation, extending from two to three years, and involving an initiation of such earnest severity as no candidate for membership would submit to in our day.

The practical questions which now emerge are these: Can this earlier Church experience be regained? If so, on what conditions?

The answer to the former question is undoubtedly "Yes." To the latter the following considerations apply:—

(1) There must be a real personal devotion to Christ on the part of every member. Without this it is not possible to gather into His Name at all.

(2) The Fellowship must be a reality; there must be oneness of heart and mind. The Unity of the Spirit means utter friendliness in the "Household of the Faith," and goodwill to all. The Church must be a living entity with a consciousness of itself in Christ.

(3) As a living organism the Fellowship must grow, not only in the development of the character of each of its members, but in its corporate character, attaining a clearer vision of Christ with the progressive holiness and power that belong to that vision.

(4) It must continually, as the very condition of its being, proclaim in various ways its gospel of redemption and hope, and, gathering into itself the raw material of believing humanity, incorporate it in its own ever-expanding life, and so transform it into the likeness of God.

What follows is an attempt to set forth in few words the method adopted by a small country Church which, with these considerations in view, set out some twelve years ago to make a great experiment.

In this Church, as in so many Churches of our order, the only meeting for members as members used to be a monthly meeting, held after or instead of a week-evening prayer meeting. Whereas in the early Church even the relief of the poor was found to be too much a matter of "serving tables" to engage the Church, this meeting was wont to "serve tables" very generously, dealing, with equal readiness, with drainage or discipline, paint or pulpit supply, the tuning of the organ or the admission of a young disciple on confession of faith. When it was suggested to likely youths and maidens that it was their duty to "join the Church," the only peculiar privilege that could be offered to them was the very doubtful one of attending and voting at this meeting, and taking an active part in its occasional squabbles over things that did not matter very much.

The first step upward, therefore, was the abolition of this monthly "business" meeting, and the handing over of all routine and official administration to the Executive, which became responsible for such matters as pulpit supply, ordinary finance, use and maintenance of church premises, etc.

This done, Church meetings on a new model were established as weekly functions, taking the place of the prayer meeting or service. Fear was expressed that this arrangement would leave stranded a few good folk who regularly attended the week-night prayer meeting but who could not be persuaded to join the Church. In the event all such fears were proved groundless, for as soon as the renewed Church came into being these joined it readily enough.

From the beginning it was felt by those primarily responsible for the change that if the coming generations of members were to be brought to a realization of these meetings as true gatherings of the Church—and especially if the young people entering into fellowship were to be taught to regard them in that light—it was essential that they should be, in fact and in form, sacrosanct. It was agreed that, whatever else in the weekly round of Church activities had to be abandoned occasionally, the gathering of the Church into the presence of Christ would have to be maintained.

The logic of the matter is relentless and obvious if the implications of Church membership and Church meetings are what this article claims for them. Moreover, by a rigidly punctilious regard for the assemblies of the Fellowship and an undeviating regularity in holding them, some even of the most hardened of the old-type of "Church member" may be brought to a realization of their sanctity and supremacy.

By degrees changes were made in the devotional forms of the Church meeting. It came to be felt that long prayers (a right and pious exercise for the mature and experienced saint) should be reserved for private use. Indeed, in a fellowship embracing Christians of different degrees of experience and spiritual need, long individual

items, either of prayer, exposition, or exhortation, were not generally advisable.

There were found in the meeting some who were willing to take a share in the common worship, but who had no gift of extempore utterance. A number of short prayers or collects were prepared therefore: (1) for Missions, Home and Foreign; (2) for the sick; (3) for the children and young people of the Church; (4) for other Churches; and these, by allocation before the meeting, became an item in the order of service. These prayers, of course, differed from week to week. The reading of Scripture, whether in the form of introductory sentences or as a lection or responsively, was usually undertaken by some other member, though selected by the minister.

As well as free prayer, silent and collective confession and petition found a frequent place in the order. It was proved to be good to vary the devotional character of the meeting as much as possible, especially keeping in mind the needs of the young people, who soon began to make the Church meeting their own trysting-place with their Lord.

At this point it may be well to say that in nothing has the Church meeting under description been marked by more striking results than in its appeal to the young people, who at the present time constitute more than fifty per cent of its attendance. The senior department of the Sunday-school has been changed in character, definitely to lead into effective membership of this type, and while in the Church itself there are two grades in membership (Associate and Covenant Membership), there are seven grades between the middle school and effective Church Fellowship. Nor has the result been manifest on the side of entrance alone. Within the membership has arisen a Church community, open to those who are earnest enough to submit themselves to its more advanced discipline. But of this society, which meets each week after the Church meeting, and in which a method of further graduation is in being, this mere mention must suffice. The point to be noticed is that it grew out of, and is a department of, the Church meeting.

No return to the New Testament plan of a weekly Church meeting is likely to be deemed complete without the Lord's Supper. As a beginning, it was included in the order once a month. New members were received then (an occasion marked with as much impressiveness as might be) by the whole assembly. This does not mean that there has been any alteration with respect to the usual monthly Sunday open Communion. In the community the Eucharist is kept at every meeting when it has not been observed by the full Fellowship.

Too much stress cannot be laid upon the essential friendliness of the true Church member. Without it no Church life is possible. Consequently the Church meeting should be, by character and

constitution, the home of fellowship. Where the Church meetings are weekly, it is possible for the Church to be a real factor in the life of everyone on its roll. Is a member sick or in trouble? The Church sends visitors direct from its assembly. Has death visited a home? The Church is represented there, not casually, but by due appointment, and a letter goes from the Fellowship. The whole round of life's happenings—birth, baptism, marriage, death, loss, gain, success, failure—all become the concern of the Church. Letters from the meeting to members afar, or long sick; letters to sister Churches under some unusual happening, or on County Union occasions, are highly valued, and in sending them the Church itself is enriched.

With a weekly Church meeting the Church's connexion with its different departments has become close and direct. New officers in the different departments of Sunday-school activity are appointed by dedication in the Church itself. The Cradle Roll belongs to the Fellowship, and at every baptism it is represented by two "Church friends," who stand for the Church's interest in the child. Their work is not sponsorship in those things which are really the responsibility of the parents, but they are pledged to prayer for and interest in the child, and to see that each year as the infant's birthday comes round his name finds a place in the Church's prayer for the the children. The Cradle Rolls hangs in the Church Room, and bears not only the child's name, but those of the two Church friends as well.

It need scarcely be said that all elections to office in the Church take place in the meeting. Conferences on phases of the work, on Scripture subjects, and on matters affecting the corporate life of Christendom, take the place of an address ever and anon. Too glib utterance on any matter is not to be looked for in an atmosphere in which a sense of the Holy Presence is not diminished by a happy homeliness. It has indeed to be recorded (whether it is to be reckoned an improvement or the reverse each must judge for himself) that speech is not quick under constraint of the apostolic rule, "If any speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." But that this was a rule for the Church meeting who can doubt?

In concluding this brief description a few general rules and explanations on points of detail may not be out of place.

(1) No matter should be allowed for discussion in the meeting that has not been approved as a fit and proper subject to engage the Church in the Presence of Christ. The Executive is called upon to decide not the question that is proposed, but only whether it is a right subject for the Church meeting. If they are in doubt, the Church itself may be asked to decide on the general question of appropriateness; but if the decision is in favour of its introduction, it should be brought forward at a later meeting.

(2) A list of attendances at both the Church meetings and the monthly open Church Communions should be kept and published quarterly.

(3) Records of meetings should be kept and read once a month. They should be very brief.

(4) No announcement of any particular "business" that is to engage the Church should be made previously. Members should attend because it is the place of the Presence, not for any more meagre reason. They who come to "vote" upon a specially exciting issue are not likely to make any valuable discernment of their Lord's will in the matter. If any "business" of this order can be decided merely by an expression of common sense and without any direct reference to the great Head of the Church Himself, it might have been dealt with by the Executive. The Church is not a democracy, but a theocracy.

(5) The preparations for a Church meeting should be undertaken *con amore* and with great care. To conduct a meeting helpfully on these lines is not possible with slip-shod or last-minute arrangements. Many week-evening services are deserted by earnest young people because their leaders so obviously do not regard them as worthy of painstaking preparation. The reference here is not to sermons or addresses, but to the order of service, the "worshipful" condition of the room and its cheerfulness withal. It speaks much for the invincible godliness of the age that the week-evening worship still continues in some Churches, for its setting is often inexpressibly mundane and dreary.

Lastly, a board should be hung where all can see it, similar to the chapel hymn-board, but with spaces for at least a dozen items. The type need not be anything like so large as that required for the public services. Thereon the order of the meeting should be fully and carefully set forth. This will go far to ensure the orderly sequence of the meeting. In addition to figures the following cards will be required: Hymn, Hymn-Solo, Psalm, Prayer (i.e. free prayer or the minister's prayer), Prayers (the pre-arranged series of short prayers), Reading, Address, Conference, Communion, Response, Election, Report, Membership, Appointment, Records, Dedication, Resolution, Notices, Reception.

It may be asked: Have these developments served to restore any of the outstanding conditions of Church life in the early days?

Results in such a sphere are notoriously hard to tabulate. On some counts, too, probably only an outsider living in the district could form a just estimate. Moreover, twelve years suffices in so great an undertaking only to make a beginning. These things may, however, be said. In a somewhat difficult country-side, with an average distance to traverse of rather more than a mile, the Church

meeting commands the attendance of half of the "able" membership, and no unfriendly or bitter word has been heard at any meeting. That there is a growing unity and earnestness manifest none who have known the Church during the period under review would deny.

With respect to growing vision and power, the Church has its story to tell, and it is a hopeful one; but, so far, the evil spirits that have been cast out have not been abnormal in any psychological sense; of exceptionally dramatic deliverances as from poison or serpent's bite it has no evidence to offer; and if in the blue-book of its evidence it has proofs not a few of the power of prayer to heal and save, it has entered none as yet that are in any way spectacular. But, for all that. . . .

C. Ernest Watson.

HOW TO USE A DOWN-TOWN CHURCH

In a number of our large cities where shops, factories and offices crowd close upon one another one occasionally comes upon a Church stranded and left high and dry by the ebb of the population from that district. Sometimes such a Church struggles on—kept alive by the devoted efforts of a faithful few—but more often than not it becomes derelict, and in any case its future use and purpose are a problem.

It has been said that our difficulties, if dealt with aright, may become our assets, and the Church which has lost its power largely because of its position may gain it tenfold by reason of that very position. One of the greatest needs of the Church at present is workers who are not only devoted, but equipped with the necessary knowledge, theoretical and practical, to carry on the multifarious agencies of her work—Schools, Bible Classes, Play Centres and Clubs—which in many cases fail of their purpose through lack of suitable leaders.

Berkley Street Church can hardly claim to be a down-town Church, since it is in a residential district, but the experiment which has been made there by the Liverpool and District Young People's Council might perhaps be tried with advantage by those who are seeking a solution of the "down-town" Church problem.

In the autumn of 1919 the Council took over the church, which had then been closed for some little time, and after it had been repaired and renovated, it was opened in March 1920 to serve the Liverpool and District Churches as a Training Centre and the immediate neighbourhood as a Church and Social Institute.

The Training Centre course is planned in three terms of eleven weeks, corresponding roughly to the ordinary College terms. It

is open free to Congregational students; others pay a small fee. The course extends over a period of four years—each student attending one hour weekly for theoretical work, and fitting in practical work by arrangement. Since the greater number of students are engaged in some business or profession all this work is done in the evening. The syllabus includes the study of the Old and New Testaments on modern lines, elementary principles of Education and Social Study.

In the first year it has been found wise to limit the groups to eight members, in order that individual difficulties may be stated and met; but in following years the work is done in lecture groups of about sixteen members. In order to develop a corporate spirit and make the Centre a place of fellowship, four united meetings are arranged during the year. In October 1920 forty-six students entered for the course, but by the summer term the numbers had risen to seventy-six; now the Centre accommodates about a hundred students. A preliminary diploma is granted at the end of two, the intermediate after three, and the final after four years' study, provided that classwork has been satisfactory, and certain practical work done. For the final diploma a certain amount of written work is required.

A well-equipped reading-room and bookstall is an important feature of the work. Here it is possible to obtain denominational literature dealing with various subjects, and books on missionary enterprise, social welfare and education, as well as books needed in connexion with the work of the Training Centre.

Closely connected with the Training Centre, and affording an outlet where students may learn to put theory into practice, are the Social Institute, the Sunday-school and the Church, all carried on in the same building.

There are clubs for junior and senior boys, open on different nights in the week and providing amusements of many kinds—badminton, billiards, chess, ping-pong, etc.—and outdoor sports are catered for by the cricket and football clubs. The general Club is affiliated to the Liverpool Union of Boys' Clubs.

Provision is made for social work amongst girls in junior and senior clubs, meeting weekly for instruction in handwork and physical culture, music and indoor recreation; outdoor games such as net-ball and rounders are also played, and a branch of the "Camp Fire Girls" is in being.

Boys and girls under twelve years of age attend the Play Centre.

At first the work was in charge of one person, but owing to the rapid development of the work it became necessary to appoint an assistant giving whole time service, and the Committee were fortunate in securing Miss Bradley, B.A., who took up her duties

in September 1921, this appointment greatly strengthening the work of the Social Institute.

An educational element is provided by the Young People's Fellowship, open to all members of the clubs of sixteen years and upwards. The Fellowship meets every Tuesday evening, and its varied programme includes devotional meetings, debates, lectures, and musical evenings.

The Sunday-school has about eighty scholars, divided into lower and upper schools ; the seniors are passed on into the Church Guild, which meets on Sunday afternoons in the church.

The teachers meet weekly to discuss organization, aims, service, etc., and together plan out the syllabus which they feel to be most suitable for the school. A close connexion is kept, by visitation, with the homes from which the children come, and a definite attempt made by means of quarterly reports, parents' conferences and meetings on the school premises, to keep the parents in touch with the instruction the children are receiving, and obtain their sympathetic co-operation.

It is recognized that all the clubs, societies and organizations fail of their purpose unless they help to bring the members into personal fellowship with Christ. Towards this aim weekday activities may contribute, but more is needed. A service, therefore, is held in the Church every Sunday evening, and while there is no obligation upon those who belong to the Social Institute to attend, they are heartily welcomed, along with others who have no such connexion. A few months ago it was found desirable to open a Church Membership Roll, and thus it seems that a Church will be built again where once it flourished.

It is not easy to describe a scheme which as yet is only in its early stages, but the response with which the whole work has met so far encourages its supporters to feel that it is helping to meet one of the needs of our time, and will fully justify its continued existence.

M. O. Paulden.

FOREIGN REVIEWS

Die Religion des Neuen Testaments. By Dr. Paul Feine, of Halle-Wittenberg. Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer. 1922. 500 m.

Post-war German theology bears the marks of acute suffering. There are unmistakable signs of a deepened interest in spiritual things. In circles where you might least expect it you find a very real hunger for religion. This is not a rare phenomenon in times of social and political upheaval. German theological writers are aware of this, and betray considerable anxiety not to offer a stone when men are begging for bread. As a result of this one detects a new emphasis on the experimental and practical aspects of religion. Even writers whose aims and whose methods are purely scientific are more ready to recognize the spiritual values that Christianity possesses. This is true of both wings of German theological thought—the " positive " and the " liberal," as they are called in Germany, conservative and progressive as they are known among us. The first two books we are to consider represent these two wings, and Dr Feine's *Die Religion des Neuen Testaments* represents the former. It is dominated by a spiritual interest, and lays down the principle, which some of us associate with the great name of Professor Herrmann, that to understand the New Testament rightly, it must have exercised a real religious influence over us. That is to say, it cannot be properly understood if it is merely conceived intellectually or scientifically. Its meaning and its message can only be spiritually discerned. But before we consider the matter of the book a few words must be devoted to the form. It is written in characteristically modern German, which will be a comfort to anyone who has tried to read Kant or Hegel. In fact, we confidently urge men who are not yet quite at home with German to read a book of this kind, the style of which is simple and the vocabulary not too extensive. The sentences are short, and the argument is always clear. It is full of New Testament quotations, which are mostly given *in extenso*. This is a considerable help to the beginner. Happily, the old German type is not used, and so the novice escapes the additional task of making out the letters. Though the book only contains 286 pages, more than half of it is in small type. But this will be an advantage to those who are reading a German theological book for the first time. They can miss the small print without losing the thread of the argument. As the author's purpose is primarily religious, not much space is devoted to an examination of the sources (*quellenstudium*). The scientific student will regret this, and one must admit that the author takes a good deal for granted. Christianity for him is nothing but the religion of Jesus. Jesus stands in the middle point of the gospel. The whole of the New Testament is conceived as a unity amid variety, and is dominated by His mind and His message. Dr. Feine is more concerned with the value of the New Testament as it stands, and with the need of the world for its great teaching. This is perhaps unusual, and is certainly welcome in a German theologian. He avoids that tiresome habit found in some German writers of explaining away the independence and the originality of Jesus by digging out a far-fetched parallel in Greek mysteries or Oriental mysticism. The persons of the New Testament are represented sometimes as automata worked by wires connected somewhere in the

East or in the West. It may be that they make use of ideas that were current in the world at the time; but they so radically transform them by giving them a new content that for all practical purposes they are new ideas. At the same time he is always reminding us that the New Testament rests on the Old, and can only be rightly understood when this relation is appreciated. The historicity and the originality of Jesus is the main theme of the book. Christianity is not a product of the apostolic age. It is a creation of Jesus. The whole problem—so acute for some minds—of the relation between Jesus and Paul is handled with insight and common sense. The faith of Paul rests on Jesus, and cannot be understood apart from Him. He even urges that Paul, the zealous young Pharisee, had participated, as a hearer at least, in the contests between the Pharisees and Jesus. Occasionally Dr. Feine weakens his case by making assumptions of the kind just mentioned, when there are other and stronger arguments available. However, we think that his book is a complete and valuable restatement of the contents of the New Testament in the interest of practical religious life. The purely speculative temper is severely repressed. The writer is not blind to difficulties. He honestly faces them, and is often very happy and acute in dealing with them.

Apostel und Jünger. By ROLAND SCHÜTZ, of Kiel. Giessen: Töpelmann. 1921. 400 m.

This interesting critical study of the sources of the Acts was sent to us very kindly by Dr. Grieve, of Lancashire College. It came rather late, and ought really to be reviewed by a New Testament scholar of the first rank, as it is an important challenging work by a younger German scholar of conspicuous ability. It represents the best work of the "liberal" wing in German theology. While the critical interest predominates, the author recognizes the imperative need of religion. "To-day, when our Fatherland seems to have lost everything, many groups of people feel a deep hunger for religion" (p. 116). At the same time he recognizes that pure scholarship has a legitimate function to fulfil in satisfying that hunger. No true and lasting satisfaction can be based on ignorance and illusion. Towards the end of his work he lays down the principle that the oldest sources are the purest, and his main task is to discover these and to bring us through the study of them into close contact with the historical realities which are still the hope of the world. We are glad to notice that his critical studies have led the author to one important general conclusion: "The original and creative strength of the person of Jesus has called forth a movement which took less from Judaism and Hellenism than it gave to these two chief representatives of the existing Syncretism constituted by Oriental religion and Greek civilization" (p. 94).

Such statements strengthen our confidence in the author's judgment, and make us more disposed to take his work seriously and to follow it carefully. We shall all agree with the repudiation of the use made by the Tübingen school of the Hegelian dialectic, and in insisting that the empirical method has its rights in all historical investigation. As we noticed at the outset, the book is a critical study of the sources of the Acts. The author recognizes that we have in the Acts a homogeneous work by a writer who has used his sources with artistic skill. He has written his book for Christians who find themselves in a difficult situation. He aims at giving steadfastness and joyous confidence to anxious minds, and at making a defence of Christianity against Jew and Roman. This leads him to regard the book as a product of edifying missionary propaganda rather than as

a product of pure historical perception. Here he parts company with Sir William Ramsay, who, by following the same empirical methods, came at length to place the author of the Acts "among historians of the first rank." In reading this book it would be well to keep the conclusions of the first chapter of "St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen" before us. The chief interest of Dr. Schütz's work, however, is in the analysis and description of what he regards as the two main sources of the Acts. One of these, which he calls "A," is dominated by the term "Apostle," and the other "M," by the term "Disciple" (the initial letter in the Greek being M). The former originated in Jewish Christian circles in Jerusalem, and the latter in Hellenistic circles, possibly in Galilee, Syria and Samaria. Dr. Schütz gives some valuable notes on the history of the use of these two terms; but he hardly adds much to what we find in Harnack's *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*. Then follows a descriptive analysis of the two "sources" from the standpoint of style, language, ideas, aims, and methods of missionary propaganda. The differences between these two sources are summarized under four main headings: (1) The first adherents of Jesus are called apostles in "A," disciples in "M." (2) The Holy City, Jerusalem, has the Hebraic form in "A," the Greek form in "M." (3) In "A" the Christian Church rises out of the bosom of Judaism and is under the guidance of the primitive Jerusalem community, while in "M" the broad basis of Galilee, Syria and Samaria, and the constant struggle with Judaism are regarded as the ground of the origin of Christianity. (4) According to "A" the twelve apostles in Jerusalem are the vehicles and the mediators of the Holy Ghost, which is chiefly for the Jews; Spirit, Baptism and Mission are conceived in a particularist manner. According to "M," Spirit, Baptism, and Mission are regarded as universal in their scope and appeal, and as independent of Jerusalem. The distribution of the Acts between these two sources and their editing by the author give Dr. Schütz plenty of scope for ingenuity, in which he is not always convincing. The last thing suggested by the Acts is that it is a product of scissors and paste. One other conclusion is striking, but difficult to follow. According to our author, "A," which deals with the earlier events, is a later source, and "M," which deals with the later events, is an earlier source. The later source has a longer time to "grow" legends than the earlier. Therefore it is of less historical value. This conclusion reaches farther back than the Acts, for Dr. Schütz sees the same apostolic tradition at work in the Synoptics. The term "apostle" and the number "twelve" are regarded as a creation of the Jerusalem community, and not as the work of Jesus. Thus the "apostle" and the "disciple" tradition go back into the gospels, and we have in the struggle between these two and in the attempts at reconciliation the key to the origin of Christianity, at least in its formal organization and missionary propaganda. This rather suggests a revival in another form of the Tübingen methods of years ago.

Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus. By Dr. Hans Lietzmann, of Jena. Tübingen: Mohr. 1921. Approximately 2s. 6d. per vol.

This forms part of the great *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, to which many leading German scholars have contributed. It can hardly be called a recent work, as it began to appear so long ago as 1912. But we lost touch with German theological literature during the war. It was difficult, or rather impossible, to get the books over. Then again, Hans Lietzmann's Commentaries on the four chief epistles of Paul (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians) have been quite recently reprinted in a cheaper form, and can

be obtained separately for half a crown each. Perhaps these facts will justify a brief notice in this journal. An old pupil of Dr. Sanday's may be forgiven for thinking that the volume on the "Romans" in the "International Critical Commentary" Series was final and authoritative. But we must remember that this was published twenty-seven years ago, and those years have been fruitful ones in Biblical research. The rubbish heaps of the East have yielded their treasures. Papyri and Ostraka have been edited, and new light has been thrown on rare words and difficult constructions. Hans Lietzmann's work incorporates these results and provides a helpful supplement to Sanday and Headlam. It will not provide much homiletical material. The fifth volume of the *Handbuch* (*Praktische Auslegung des N. Test. für Prediger und Religionslehrer*) supplies this want. Happily, there are many Congregational ministers who have scholarly tastes and who keep up scholarly habits, and who are none the less faithful to their practical and pastoral work on that account. It is a type of ministry of which we may justly feel proud, and which we should do our utmost to preserve and encourage. Such ministers will find keen satisfaction and joy in *Die vier paulinischen Hauptbriefe*. A great deal of attention is devoted to the text of these epistles. In the volume on the "Romans" there is a short but valuable introduction on the history of the text of the Pauline Epistles. The MSS. are classified in three main groups, described as: The Egyptian, the Western, and the Koine. But why is Tischendorf's time-honoured denomination of the Cod. Sinaiticus "Aleph" altered into "S"? The discussions on the readings in the body of the Commentaries are very full and thorough, and the explanations of their probable origin interesting. There is a wealth of classical illustration and apt quotation from contemporary sources which greatly enriches the exegesis. They will provoke to good works the student who has allowed his Greek and Latin to get rusty. As an illustration of his suggestiveness I would quote the explanation of the rather difficult passage, Rom. xv. 28: "When therefore I have accomplished this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will go on by you unto Spain." Sanday and Headlam interpret σφραγισάμενος as "having set the seal of authentication on." "The seal was used as an official mark of ownership: hence especially the expression—the seal of baptism." Here Lietzmann, following Deissmann, uses the papyri with effect. "To seal fruit" becomes a more intelligible expression when instances of its use have been found in connexion with sealing sacks of wheat or fruit as a guarantee of the correctness of their contents. If the fruit is sealed, then everything is in order. In the matter of the collection, the apostle would have everything secured and delivered in security. Scattered through all four parts will be found exhaustive notes on special subjects referred to in the epistles: on the "Pauline Psychology" in the Romans, "Sacramental Meals" in 1 Corinthians, "the last Judgment" in 2 Corinthians, "Paul and the Old Testament" in Galatians, to mention only a few of the more elaborate. They are marked by great learning and insight, and in almost all cases form a valuable supplement to the longer notes and excursus in Sanday and Headlam. Finally, reference must be made to the translation of the text of the epistles. This is the unique feature of all the Commentaries of the *Handbuch*, and is not the least valuable. In the various editions of Meyer, including the latest, there is no translation as far as we are aware. This is a defect which the *Handbuch* makes good, and among all the translations Lietzmann's is pre-eminent. It is very interesting to compare this with Luther's (this very year four hundred years old). How much Germany is indebted to that great translation! It standardized a pure and noble style, and imparted to her spoken

and her written language a religious and evangelical tone which is not the least of her spiritual inheritances from the great Reformer. There is also a rugged strength about Luther's translation which corresponds to the rugged strength of the original. The words of Paul do not flow as honey from his lips; he struggles with an expression before our very eyes, so hot and eager is his heart and so pregnant and profound his thought. Luther reflects all this to a remarkable degree. But four hundred years makes a difference to a living language, and Lietzmann has taken full advantage of the added fineness and precision of terms, the wealth of new words and constructions which centuries of developing spiritual, intellectual, literary and social experience have created. Language is a consummate work of genius, and every new phrase and new word that lives was once a happy stroke of genius. While offering thus a tribute of admiration and gratitude for Lietzmann's translation, it cannot be allowed that he is always happy, or that he always improves on Luther. For instance, Luther's *natural use* (Rom. i. 26) is to be preferred to Lietzmann's *natural sexual relation*. Luther's translation has greater dignity, and is more suitable for reading at public worship. But, as far as understanding the thought and the argument of St. Paul is concerned, Lietzmann is greatly in advance of Luther, as we should expect. He so often gives the logical sequence of the argument by supplying the words that are missing owing to the rapidity and the intensity of the apostle's thought. He helps the reader to understand the often complex and tangled argument without taking liberties either with the text or with the grammar. Where Luther uses an abstract term, Lietzmann often succeeds in supplying a concrete one, and this adds to the force and fire and realism of the passage. Luther's sentences are occasionally awkward and unwieldly, and give one the impression that he was mastered by them. Lietzmann moves with ease and grace, and with all the skill and elegance of the artist. A notebook full of parallels from the two translations tempts one to quote, but this notice is already long enough. We only hope it will inspire our readers to pursue this line of study for themselves.

La Vie en Fleur. By ANATOLE FRANCE. Paris: Calmann-Levy. 1922. 6f. 50.

A book by Anatole France is always an event, and this one is no exception. In fact, it has more than usual interest, because it gives us a glimpse into the writer's own boyhood and youth, and is a sequel to *Petit Pierre*, published two years ago. In the postscript we are told that the recollections contained in the book are true in all that concerns the principal facts, the characters, and the manners and customs of the period. The names and circumstances of individuals are changed so as not to offend their pride or their modesty. The book reminds us of two others: *Cuore*, by the Italian novelist Edmondo de Amicis, and the *Souvenirs* of Renan. The former contains a delightful series of studies of school and boy life under Italian skies and conditions. The latter pulsates with the passionate love of beauty and truth that gives to Anatole France's work such charm and such distinction. And yet can we altogether say that he is a lover of truth? To be a lover of truth one must surely be a believer in it. In his concluding paragraph he says:—

> "I love truth. I believe humanity needs it; but certainly it has a much greater need for the illusions that flatter it, that console it, and that give it infinite hope. Without illusions it would perish of despair and tedium."

Renan was an optimist and a believer in progress, but Anatole France unhappily believed that the very instrument for the expression of truth, viz. language, was so defective that it would be incapable of expressing the truth if we found it. He is quite at one with such writers as Macchiavelli in his conviction of the radical badness of human nature. How often that jarring note is struck in *The Prince* and the *Discourses on Livy*! People who have no faith in progress usually have no faith in humanity, and so France believed that men in general were much worse than they seemed. He says: "I have rarely opened a door inadvertently without discovering a spectacle that made me regard humanity with feelings of pity, disgust and horror." Poor Anatole France! One is sorry that he has not had better luck in his human contacts and relationships. We have got the worst over, and this is a sort of sting in the tail. The book itself gives us some delightful and refreshing pictures of lovable human beings—men and boys, women and children. It is rather hard on this brave company to dismiss them all with a round of abuse. They deserved a better fate. We learn from this book how impossible it is to educate a man of genius. No educational system can contain him. No discipline can control him. We recall Shelley and Calverley and Swinburne. The records of school life contained in *La vie en Fleur* ring with shouts of ironical laughter. The masters were ignorant pedants and impotent tyrants; but when he had played pranks on them and got some fun out of them, he was ready to forgive them for their incompetence. The chapter on playing truant (*faire l'école buissonnière*—delicious phrase!) is full of clever fooling. Such days are really eternal because they make us forget the past and the future. Genius is always solitary, and possibly on that account dangerous. France was incapable of deriving any profit from instruction given in common. His reason seemed impervious to it, and his mind rebellious. The little he learned at school he learned by himself. Yet in these sordid classrooms and on the ink-stained benches Greece and Rome dawned upon him—the Greece which taught men science and beauty, and the Rome that pacified the world. School days that left such an impression behind cannot have been wholly in vain. Unhappily, in the Lycée of France's youth there were no healthy outdoor games to develop the character and to bring about the *camaraderie* which is one of the glories of our British public schools. France describes his schoolfellows, Fontanet, Mouron, Chazal, Laboriette, Morlot; but he nowhere gives you the impression that he owed them anything. He adored women, but the one who made him almost speechless with admiration fell in love with a young doctor, who jilted her for a wealthier bride; and the Russian sculptress, Marie Bagration, whom he regarded as a goddess, committed suicide. However much we may dislike the vein of cynicism which runs through the book from the first chapter to the last, if gives us valuable insight into the development of a writer who exercises a commanding influence in his own country and has a host of admirers here.

W. Blackshaw.

CURRENT LITERATURE

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London, unless otherwise stated.*)

A Short History of our Religion, from Moses to the Present Day. By D. C. SOMERVELL. Second Impression. Bell. 1922. 6s.

Long before the second impression of this book came to hand for review, we had read the volume and proclaimed its merits to our friends. We have no hesitation at all in describing it as the " book of the year."

To make an outline readable is never an easy task, but this outline, from Moses to the Enabling Bill, has not a dull page. It is written by a member of the Episcopal Church, whose reading is wide, whose mind is alert, and whose spirit is tolerant. No minister should fail to have it on his shelves, and if he has read it once he will consult it frequently. Laymen and ministers to whom our copy has been lent have all said it was the book they had long been seeking.

This unstinted praise does not, of course, mean that we agree with everything Mr. Somervell says. No man can be an authority on every part of so wide a subject, and specialists will find slips here and there. For example, we doubt whether a Scotch Professor will find the account of the Presbyterian Church system accurate, while it seems to us that the " experimental sect " was not that Church to which Cromwell belonged, which really went back to the days of the Apostles, but the Anglican Church as established by Elizabeth in 1559 (an altogether new thing, and neither " fish, fowl, nor good red herring ").

Mr. Somervell has opinions and is not afraid to express them, and that is one of the things which makes his book so readable and attractive :—

" Thus the Hussite heresy became a recognized and tolerated variety within the Church ; and no doubt the future unity of Christendom, if it ever can be achieved, will be achieved on these lines. Uniformity is impossible and very likely not desirable. Unity in the service of God, combined with diversity in the method of worshipping Him, is the hope of the future."

" But Puritanism was not without its permanent achievements in the sphere of social life. It established what is known abroad as the ' English Sunday.' The Puritans prohibited both work and play on the ' Day of Rest.' We are apt to suppose that they only prohibited play, and as a result we are not sufficiently grateful to them. But they did a great deal in suppressing work as well, as is shown by the fact that the anti-Puritan government of Elizabeth deliberately encouraged work, buying and selling, on Sundays as well as weekdays. The modern ' week-ender ' who laughs at ' Sabbatarianism ' has the Sabbatarian to thank for his week-end freedom."

We commend the writer's conclusion—" first, that our Foundation is Rock ; secondly, that our superstructure is in need of repair "—to the notice of ecclesiastical statesmen of all denominations, and the book itself to all students of religion.

Christ and Cæsar. By N. Micklem, M.A., and H. Morgan, M.A.
Christian Justice. By N. L. Robinson, M.A.
Essays in Christian Thinking. By A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D.
Swarthmore Press. 1922. 6s. 6d. each.

These three volumes belong to the "Christian Revolution" series, on the general high level of which the Editor and publishers are to be warmly congratulated. The courage, conviction, and competence of the writers are of great encouragement to Christians in general, and to Free Churchmen in particular.

Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's *Lay Religion* was a very suggestive opening volume, and Congregationalism has been well represented by the scholarly contributions of the Editor, Dr. C. J. Cadoux, and Professor C. H. Dodd. The *motif* of the series is to be found in the word "personality"; the Christian revolution will be here when it is recognized that "there is a distinctively Christian valuation of personality, a Christian view of God and of man."

Christ and Cæsar and *Christian Justice* deal, in some measure, with the same problem, and should be read together. They are admirable books, and ministers and sociologists will find them very useful.

Mr. Micklem and Mr. Morgan first give careful summaries of the teaching of Marx, Dietzgen and Sorel, and then deal faithfully with Bishop Temple's view of "Church and Nation," as set forth in his "Paddock Lectures." The relation of Nationality to Humanity, of the Individual to Society, of the Church to the Kingdom (here some pertinent things are said on the nature of the true Church and on Christian union), and of Compromise to Progress, is then considered, and the writers face the problem of how to apply Christianity in a non-Christian world. Mr. Robinson gives part of the answer in the words: "What cannot be redeemed must be renounced."

He holds that the marks of true justice are: "that it is based on fellowship, looks more to character than to outward acts, and more to the future than to the past." That is to say, it is a matter of the right relationships between personalities, and therefore not to be settled in terms of merit and punishment. A very suggestive section deals with "Justice in the Teaching of Jesus," and altogether, except perhaps in the first two chapters, Mr. Robinson writes with freshness and power. Needless to say, he does not believe in eternal punishment, in war, or in our prison system.

Dr. A. T. Cadoux's papers are a worthy addition to the series, and we wish space allowed us to illustrate his terse and effective style. Clear and frank, thoughtful and thought-provoking, they deal with fundamental themes—Personality, Miracles, Providence, Prayer, as well as the Person, Death, and Work of Jesus.

Two minor points may deserve the Editor's consideration. In these days many ministers do not read German, or even Latin, with any facility, and these books ought to be in the hands of many (laymen and ministers) whose education included only one language. We suggest, therefore, that the translation of quotations be an invariable rule. Secondly, we enter a mild protest against printing "self-limitation" and "self-interest" as "selflimitation" and "selfinterest."

Outspoken Essays. Second Series. By W. R. Inge, C.V.O., D.D., F.B.A.
Longmans. 1922. 6s.
The Church and the Drink Evil. Edited by Henry Carter. Temperance Council of the Christian Churches. 1922. 6d.

The Dean of St. Paul's here reprints the much discussed lectures on "The Idea of Progress" and "The Victorian Age," as well as articles

from the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*. There are, however, several new essays, including the very interesting "*Confessio Fidei*," with which the volume opens.

Dean Inge is rendering great service to our generation, and he enjoys doing it; obviously he takes pointed pleasure in demolishing the *idola fori* and stabbing our spirits broad awake! With wide knowledge and mordant wit, he lays bare the weaknesses of modern life, and for the stimulus and provocation the modern Socrates gives us we ought to be grateful.

Yet it seems to us that Dr. Inge is in danger of becoming an ecclesiastical "master of flouts and jeers"! After all, mankind will never be saved by caustic speech and contemptuous superiority, and much less capable persons than the Dean can pour satire on human folly; we have the right to look to him for something better. To destroy the "superstition of automatic progress" is good, and so is the reiterated plea for eugenics; but often Dr. Inge's prejudices seem quite as strong as those of the classes he appears to despise. We know, for example, that there are "teetotal fanatics," but the Dean seems to ignore altogether the might of the drink evil, and we include another book in this review to draw his attention—and that of our readers—to an excellent piece of work on which the Rev. Henry Carter and the Temperance Council of the Churches are to be congratulated. Were the Dean to read this, he would surely hesitate before repeating a careless sentence like "the State has exceeded its rights by prohibiting some harmless act such as the consumption of alcohol." Again, we cannot understand how the Dean accommodates his belief in Christianity as the hope of the world with his views on internationalism, which he seems to limit to socialistic propaganda.

Dr. Inge does not like people to dogmatize, and sometimes his protest is delightfully expressed:—

"Emerson, indeed, tells us that 'One accent of the Holy Ghost, The careless world has never lost.' But I should like to know how Emerson obtained this information."

He himself writes, however (italics ours):—

"There has never been, *nor will there be again*, such an opportunity for gloating over this kind of improvement."

Naturally *we* should like to know how the Dean obtained *this* information! The volume is filled with brilliant and striking sayings, some of which are to be found in what is perhaps the weakest section, the lectures on "The State, Visible and Invisible." A few may perhaps be quoted:—

> "The Labour movement can provide its own hired advocates; the business of the clergy is to preach the Gospel and to speak the truth."
>
> "Organized Christianity is at present under a cloud. The Churches have but little influence, and if they had more, they would not know what to do with it."
>
> "A good government remains the greatest of human blessings, and no nation has ever enjoyed it."
>
> "The little finger of Lenin is thicker than the loins of Nicholas I.'
>
> "Ancient civilizations were destroyed by imported barbarians; we breed our own."

The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher. By H. J. PICKETT. Holborn Publishing House. 1922. 5s.

Oracles of God: Studies in the Minor Prophets. By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. James Clarke. 1922. 6s.

We are sorry to have to confess to some disappointment in reading the first of these books, though probably this is entirely due to the great

expectations with which we opened it. It is difficult to say anything very new about the Hebrew prophets or about Modern Preaching, so well have Old Testament scholars and Yale lecturers and the like done their work; and so, while this book is a useful contribution to the subject, more cannot be claimed for it. Notwithstanding this, the new Hartley lecture is sound and readable, alike in the section dealing with the Hebrew prophets, that expounding the prophetic method of Jesus, and finally in the chapter dealing with preachers of to-day. It is a pleasure to notice the high regard the author has for the character and scholarship of Dr. Peake, a modern prophet, who is certainly not without honour in his own denomination—and country.

Dr. Orchard's volume shows how the minor prophets can be used by the modern preacher. Many who know its writer as a flaming enthusiast and a bewildering ritualist, may not be aware that he regularly exercises a teaching ministry of a remarkable kind. Some years ago we sought to discover how London ministers solved the problem of the week-night service, and found at the Weigh House a considerable audience listening to a series of lectures, in no sense of the word "popular," on "The First Three Christian Centuries." In this book, in the "Humanism of the Bible" series, Dr. Orchard expounds the minor prophets in lucid and incisive style, making clear as he goes along the intellectual background of his pacifism, ceremonialism, and anti-individualism.

•

Lectures on Preaching and Sermon Construction. By P. B. Bull. S.P.C.K. 1922. 8s. 6d.

We are rather sorry for the writer of this book. He is a man with a message to deliver, but he has put fetters on his own feet and a gag between his own teeth. When he forgets that he is Father Bull of the Community of the Resurrection, he says boldly the things he ought to say—true, vigorous, alive, pertinent. At other times he is so bound with the grave-clothes of Anglo-Catholicism, that he simply mumbles over and over in mechanical fashion the formularies of his narrow faith. Nevertheless, this will not prevent his book from being of benefit, not only to the "Young Priests," for whom it is written, but also to preachers who do not employ Father Bull's terminology. It contains much advice of a practical kind as well as a thorough discussion of the nature and art of preaching, and it is to be welcomed as a sign that the Church of England is at last recognizing the need and the power of the preached word. Her failure to train her clergy in the past is evident in every chapter of this book. "Young Priests" are warned, for example, not to assume that the Kings of Old Testament history are like modern monarchs, and that "sun and water have a different significance in tropical countries from what they have for us in England," and many pages of the book are taken up with psychology so elementary that it is hard to think it could not have been assumed. Father Bull's prejudices are always evident. Though he speaks of the "most mischievous doctrine of Verbal Inspiration," he says that Peake's Commentary may be used, but "with much caution"! Not the least interesting part of the book consists of illustrative matter at the end of the chapters, while the last few pages on Sectional Addresses are very useful. We wish that the freedom which marks the practical part of the book had been evident throughout.

> "Do not be afraid of being silent; if you have nothing to say, say nothing, but do not say er-r-r-r or um-m-m-m. Silence may conceal thought, but er-r-r-r betrays its absence."

"*Avoid difficult words.* It is said that the British working man has a vocabulary of only 800 words, and prolonged attention to his conversation suggests that these include only one adjective."

The writer of such paragraphs could have written a book on preaching that would have revolutionized theological colleges and turned the Church of England upside down. As it is, we fear the high ideal of the ministry which he sets up will have its full influence only on those who belong to his own school of thought. There is some repetition which might have been avoided and occasionally long passages that have no vital connexion with the subject. No one reading p. 214 would guess that it came from a book of lectures on preaching.

The Creative Christ. A Study of the Incarnation in Terms of Modern Thought. By E. S. DROWN, D.D. Hodder. 1922. 6s.

Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition. By O. C. QUICK, M.A. Longmans. 1922. 7s. 6d.

Both these volumes consist of lectures delivered in the United States by Episcopalians, one by the Professor in the Episcopalian Theological School in Cambridge, Mass., the other by Canon Quick, who—through his review pages in *The Pilgrim* and his other writings—is coming to be recognized as one of the most thoughtful students of to-day.

Both books are well worth the consideration of thinking people, and the Episcopal Church is happy in the possession of scholars like the authors. Both are concerned with Christology, the one desiring to "make Christ real for our age," the other to outline a "modern orthodox Christology." Traversing very different routes, they reach the same destination, and we regret that space does not permit an outline of their arguments. Perhaps this is just as well, as the books are so succinct that they do not yield themselves readily to summary, and we would not be unjust to such scholarly works.

Dr. Drown, we imagine, must be an excellent teacher; we have rarely seen the art of recapitulation so well employed, and his lectures are to be commended for their method as for their content. Canon Quick's estimates of Liberal Protestantism and Catholic and Evolutionary Modernism are conspicuously fair, and he does not fail when he comes to the constructive portion of his theme. He, too, can write clear, crisp sentences that are not easily forgotten:—

"To be true to the Fathers is to follow not their formulas but their faith."

British History in the Nineteenth Century. By G. M. TREVELYAN. Second Impression. Longmans. 1922. 12s. 6d.

England Under Edward VII. By J. A. FARRER. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 10s. 6d.

England To-day. By G. A. GREENWOOD. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 5s.

Mr. Trevelyan's fascinating volumes on *Garibaldi*, on *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, and on *Grey of the Reform Bill*, have proved that he knows how history can be made interesting. He has now succeeded in the more difficult task of summarizing British history from 1782 to 1901, in 424 pages, in readable fashion and with due proportion. Sometimes, of course, he is obliged to assume considerable knowledge on the part of his readers; the average sixth-form boy or undergraduate to-day, for example, would scarcely understand the reference to "the wrongs of Captain Dreyfus."

But no doubt this is inevitable in an outline volume, and Mr. Trevelyan

has shown that such a volume need be neither a mere list of dates nor an arid chronicle of events. The chapter on the Industrial Revolution is excellent, and there are passages throughout—that on the last night of slavery in the British Empire, for example—of beauty and power.

The writer has opinions, and expresses them freely; his humanity is always shining through his pages and making them live. Guizot is "a great historian blind to the lessons of history"; in the first half of the century "the reputation of Whitehall for laziness and incompetence was proverbial. Heavy swells with long whiskers lounged in late and left early." There is no hesitation in speaking of "that spirit of liberal government which . . . has held together the modern British Empire, and has never been neglected without disaster." Pregnant phrases abound: Russia seeks "a warm-water port—a window whence the imprisoned giantess could look out upon the world;" the Fabians "exonerated Socialists from the heavy obligation of reading Karl Marx"; the Venezuelan boundary "was a diplomatic 'case in Chancery,' without a beginning anyone remembered or an end anyone expected." Decidedly a book to be read at least twice, and then kept for reference.

To leave Mr. Trevelyan for Mr. Farrer is to leave history for politics. One is "above the battle," the other emphatically in it; one writes to relate facts, the other to demonstrate a theory; one's style is clear, the other's at times so confused that the meaning does not at first appear.

Mr. Farrer's theory is that Edward VII was his own Foreign Minister, that he deliberately aimed at encircling Germany, and was responsible for the "Ententes" with France, Russia and Japan, and therefore responsible also for the policy that inevitably produced the war. Reviewers have dealt somewhat hardly with Mr. Farrer. They have spoken of the "Encirclement Legend," and said that only a foreigner ignorant of our constitution could believe that our monarch played a prominent part in diplomacy. Having read reviews of this kind, and before Mr. Farrer's book reached us, we turned up our commonplace book to read Sir Charles Dilke's opinion (in 1880) and Lord Morley's (in 1908), and we still think Mr. Farrer is right to say that both Victoria and Edward regarded "the direction of . . . foreign affairs as more than any other the special province of the sovereign," and that both carried their interference to unconstitutional lengths. Nevertheless, Edward did not deliberately aim at encirclement, though his "Ententes" policy led in that direction. The mutual fears of two great nations—Britain fearing isolation and Germany encirclement—gradually, but surely, pushed the Governments into policies that made war certain. Both talked of "defensive alliances," but with tongue in cheek, for both believed attack to be the best form of defence (did not Fisher want to "Copenhagen" the German Fleet?).

Mr. Farrer is too inclined to see nothing good in his own country's diplomacy, and he fails to suggest what steps our Government might have taken in view of the building of the German battle fleet (Haller in *Die Aera Bülow* admits that this was the real cause of British hostility), but he makes two points quite clear:—

> (1) If peace is to be maintained, the "Balance of Power" must go; Kings and Governments must not be allowed to parade groups of states in rivalries that inevitably lead to war.
>
> (2) The Press must be made to recognize its responsibility. In 1908 Sir Edward Grey said that "half the difficulties of foreign policy arose from the ingenuity of the Press in different countries in imputing motives to each other's Governments," and Mr. Kennedy Jones's oft-quoted statement, "What sells a newspaper? . . . The first answer is, War," shows where the danger lies.

Mr. Greenwood is, we imagine, a Yorkshireman. He calls a spade a spade—at least—and we are never in any doubt about his convictions. We wonder, however, for whom he wrote this book. It contains little that is new to social reformers, though they will be interested in the writer's survey of the situation and impressed by his marshalling of the facts. But we fear those who would benefit most by the book will not peruse its pages. It would, for example, be a good thing if boys leaving our public schools could be given a copy, that they might realize how millions of their fellow-countrymen live ; it would be of equal service if Mr. Greenwood could get members of " Working Men's Clubs " to give an evening to its consideration. Both classes would benefit by the candour of Mr. Greenwood's criticisms. Mr. A. G. Gardiner writes a brief introduction.

Tudor Constitutional Documents, A.D. 1485–1603. With an Historical Commentary. By J. R. Tanner, Litt.D. Cambridge University Press. 37s. 6d.

There is no better way of measuring the progress of historical study during the last generation than by looking at the row of volumes on one's shelves that make accessible to students the essential documents for different periods. Gwatkin and Gee and Hardy have long stood side by side, to be reinforced recently by Dr. B. J. Kidd's *Documents of the Continental Reformation,* and by several collections relating to the Puritan Period. On the constitutional side Stubbs's *Select Charters,* a not inconsiderable obstacle that all historical students have at one time surmounted, —or avoided—Prothero's *Statutes, etc.,* 1558–1625, and Gardiner's *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution,* show signs of continual use. Now comes Dr. Tanner to join the select company of indispensables, filling the gap between Stubbs and Prothero, and duplicating the latter (with some additions) for Elizabeth's reign.

It can safely be said that no student of the Tudor period can afford to be without this book. The text of the more important statutes of the reign is given, extracts from the Council Registers are made (would that Dr. Tanner had been able to say that he had discovered the registers for the missing years !) and many cases relating to " Treason Trials," " Parliamentary Privilege," etc., are quoted. Not the least useful and interesting pages consist of quotations from contemporary writers and of miscellaneous documents.

Where we have been able to test the volume, alike in text and commentary, we have found it reliable and accurate, though there are indications on the ecclesiastical side that Dr. Tanner's acquaintance with the subject is not as thorough or as up-to-date as it might be. So much has been done in the last twenty years in eliciting the origin and rise of Nonconformity, that it is regrettable to find that Dr. Tanner is content to rely on eighteenth-century writers like Neal and Strype, and does not use contemporaries like Burrage and Pierce on the one hand, or the useful reprint, *Puritan Manifestoes,* by Frere and Douglas, on the other. It is not without significance that the edition Prothero used is that of 1906, and not the later one of 1913, and perhaps we might be permitted to say that had Dr. Tanner used the present writer's *Calendar of the Seconde Parte of a Register in Dr. Williams' Library,* his section on the Puritan Movement might have been considerably strengthened.

Dr. Tanner's range is so wide, however, that it is unreasonable to expect that he should move with equal facility over every part of it, and it would be ungracious to end this review on the note of criticism. The volume is a real addition to the student's resources.

The Doctrine of Sin. By R. S. Moxon, B.D. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 10s. 6d.

The Meaning of the Cross. By Edward Grubb, M.A. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 5s.

A distinguished preacher, seeing these volumes side by side on our shelves, remarked: "The subject's as dead as a door nail." We emphatically disagreed. Young people in the Churches are worrying about sin and psychology and their relation to the love of God and the Cross of Christ, and book after book is being eagerly read by ministers—witness, to name but a few, those of Rev. J. K. Mozley, Dr. Rashdall, Principal Franks, and Dr. Robert Mackintosh.

Here are two more excellent works, for different classes of readers. Mr. Moxon had earned his spurs by his learned *Vincentius of Lerins*, and we are now indebted to him for this "critical and historical investigation into the views of the Concept of Sin held in early Christian, Mediæval, and Modern Times." In the first chapters the doctrines of Pelagius and Augustine are carefully examined, and their relationship to the Semi-pelagianism now taught in most pulpits is brought out. Scholastic and mediæval views are then surveyed, and a most interesting chapter on the teaching of modern scholars follows—Kant, Müller, S. T. Coleridge, Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Pfleiderer, Tennant, and McDowall being discussed. Nor does Mr. Moxon join the multitude who fail when they leave exposition for construction, though his final chapter—in which a competent account of the "new psychology" in its relation to sin leads up to a new definition of Sin, Original and Actual—might have been expanded with advantage.

Mr. Grubb is adequately representing the Friends in the difficult task of mediating between the college and the congregation, the class-room and the man in the street. We have greatly enjoyed his latest work, the substance of lectures delivered at Woodbrooke, and we commend it especially to Sunday-school teachers and lay preachers. It would make a splendid book for a Young People's Study Circle, and we trust it will be widely used.

The Lord of Thought. By Lily Dougall and C. W. Emmet, B.D. Student Christian Movement. 1922. 12s. 6d.

The pendulum has swung with a vengeance. For many years we have been urged to find the clue to the life and teaching of Jesus in a "consistent eschatology"; now two esteemed and earnest scholars endeavour to eliminate apocalyptic elements from the Master's message altogether.

Miss Dougall, who is responsible for the Introduction and the sections on "The World into which Christ came" and "The Genius of Jesus," gives an able account of apocalyptic ideas and literature in the time of Jesus. It is recognized that "the Early Church believed in a literal and speedy Advent," but this belief was "not derived from Christ." He was free from apocalyptic conceptions of God, punishment, and life after death, but His disciples and their converts had lived in their atmosphere so long that they could not get away from it; and after the death of their Lord the tendency was, not to follow His simple teaching, but to accommodate the events of His life and death to the current notions.

Mr. Emmet provides the "critical verification" for the position held. He believes that:—(1) Schweitzer's pivot verse (Matt. x. 23, "Ye shall not have gone through . . . till the Son of Man be come") "was not spoken by Jesus at all, but that it represents the policy of a section of the Church

at a later period." (2) Mark xiii (the "little Apocalypse") does not represent an actual discourse of Jesus. (3) Matthew continually heightens passages with eschatological tendencies.

The authors are, of course, inclined to go too far in their reaction —it is easy, e.g., to read too much into the fact that Jesus, when reading Isa. lxi in the synagogue, stops before reaching "the day of vengeance of our God"—but they are to be commended for a sincere attempt to give "a divine simplicity" to the Gospel, and so help the faith they think to be "hampered by having adopted the apocalyptic visions of Jewish seers." The book, though one-sided, demands careful attention from N.T. scholars.

The New Testament. Parallel Edition, A.V. and Dr. James Moffatt's Translation. Hodder. 1922. 12s. 6d.

A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ: Based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised Version. By A. T. Robertson, D.D. Hodder. 1922. 10s. 6d.

If the Church of Christ is to be a power in the land, one of our first tasks is to make the Bible once more the book of the people. Many Christians who pride themselves on being up-to-date are governed by prejudices and presumptions of generations ago, and if the pulpit lags behind the class-room, the pew is often still further behind. Apparently it takes literally ages for knowledge accepted by scholarship to reach the masses. We must console ourselves with the words of the Bishop of Chichester to Father Paul Bull: "Do not be discouraged if it takes you a long time to get anything into the heads of my dear people. *It will take centuries to get it out.*"

We welcome these books as a help to the spreading of a better knowledge of the New Testament. Dr. Moffatt's translation was hailed on all sides as a scholarly and useful piece of work, and now we have it side by side with the A.V. Ministers who keep up their Greek long for the day when an enterprising publisher will give us a 4-column volume, with Souter's Greek text, the A.V. or R.V., Moffatt, and a blank column for notes. Meanwhile this is a step on the way.

Prefixed to the translation is an introduction, packed with information about the books of the New Testament, the Canon and Text, and English translations. If all deacons had to sit for an examination with this introduction as textbook, there would speedily be increased progress in our churches! At any rate, we commend it to them, and to all young people who desire to learn.

We think Dr. Moffatt is less than just to the Geneva translation of the Bible. Had it been as sectarian in spirit and as provincial in style as Dr. Moffatt suggests, it would not have been so tremendously popular in Elizabeth's time.

We are too easily inclined to imagine that "harmonies" are out-of-date, but Dr. Robertson's revision of the Broadus harmony will save much time for hard-pressed students. Its supreme advantage is that it is compiled by a scholar who accepts the results of modern Biblical criticism; Mark appears in the first column of the harmony, and full notes on special points are given, as well as lists of the parables, miracles, O.T. quotations in the Gospels, and uncanonical sayings of Jesus. Ministers will find Dr. Robertson's work very useful, and it should have a place on shelves devoted to books of reference.

English and American Philosophy Since 1800: a Critical Survey. By A. K. ROGERS. New York: Macmillan Co. 1922. $3.50.

Mr. Rogers disarms the critic in his Preface, for he says he would not be prepared to combat the claim that "fewer pages of criticism and more attention to historical and descriptive data would have resulted in a more generally useful volume." He holds that the best way to give an intelligible account of a philosophical doctrine is to point out its limitations and obscurities, to criticize it, in short.

He therefore surveys in turn the teaching of the Scottish Realists, the Utilitarians, the Oxford School, and the English Liberal theologians from Coleridge to Arnold. Thence he passes to the exponents of Naturalism and Evolution—an interesting section, which starts with Buckle and ends with Browning, touching Spencer, Huxley, Henry Drummond, and many another on the way. Absolute Idealism is then considered, the School associated with the names of McTaggart, Pringle-Pattison, and others being examined, as are also the views of Bradley, Bosanquet, and Royce. Personal Idealism (with Pan-psychism and Realism), Pragmatism and Neo-Realism, are carefully expounded and criticized. There is a useful Index of Authors, and a "Bibliography, Critical and Expository."

The volume will gain a deserved place by the side of the author's widely used *Students' History of Philosophy*. The hard-pressed minister, frequently bewildered by the rapid development of philosophical thought, will regularly take it down for reference. We wish it had been possible to make it a little cheaper, but there are 470 full pages.

The Divine Invasion. By HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A. J. M. Dent. 1922. 4s. 6d.

Congregationalism is not rich in laymen who can think clearly on great themes, and also express their thoughts in appropriate language. It is, therefore, with peculiar pleasure that we welcome a new book from Mr. Harold Shepheard.

These nine papers are full of suggestion, though probably some will think them too grey and sombre, and there is certainly a touch of autumn rather than of spring about them.

Mr. Shepheard is concerned to find peace and satisfaction in a perplexing world, and the perplexity and the problem present themselves to him with great force, so much so that the solution seems scarcely adequate.

> "The birds do not praise God with morning hymns, except in our ill-considered imagination: they sing for the joy of life, and slide down to the lawn to kill; and the more they have killed, the louder they sing. Is that cynical? Rather, one must think, with a tinge of fear, true."

The book is the result of the pondering of an acute and sensitive mind on the multitude and mortality of men, and on the "evil will" of life; and hope is found in the "divine invasion," which separates man from the beasts, brings virtue and conscience, and relates the world to spiritual "Wrath" and "Love." We are inclined to think that better results can be obtained if one's attitude is not so subjective. If one starts out from the historical revelation of God in Christ, the problems of the universe are seen in the light of that objective fact, and the fog clears.

Many who do not agree with Mr. Shepheard will read his papers with profit, and enjoy his use of Bergson and James, Boehme and John Davidson. We wonder, however, if he believes in a personal Devil? His "Life," so mighty and yet not God, rather suggests that he does.

The Great Secret. By MAURICE MAETERLINCK; translated by BERNARD MIALL. Methuen. 1922. 7s. 6d.

M. Maeterlinck has so many interests that a new book is always a mystery. Will *The Great Secret* be something as delightful as *The Blue Bird*, or will it give us a glimpse of nature like *The Life of the Bee*? It is concerned—*horresco referens*—with primitive religion and the occult wisdom of India, Egypt, Persia, Chaldea; with the Neoplatonists, the Kabbalists, and the modern Occultists! Not even M. Maeterlinck and his efficient translator can make such a subject attractive. With many suggestive passages, and many fine quotations from the distilled wisdom of the ages, the volume is, nevertheless, a bewildering collection of facts (and fancies) for over a period of six or seven thousand years, by one whose historical knowledge seems limited, and whose judgment is far from sound. And after the survey has been made through all the ages, concluding with the modern metapsychists, what is "the great secret"? It is that "all things are secret, that we know of no further certainties beyond an ignorance as infinite as the world or the God Who is its subject"; there "has never been any ultra-human revelation," and the best we can do is share in "the proudest confession of ignorance that man has ever ventured to pronounce."

We wish M. Maeterlinck would set to work on another *Blue Bird*!

Preaching in London: A Diary of Anglo-American Friendship. By JOSEPH FORT NEWTON. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 6s.

A volume by a distinguished minister which refers to events still fresh in our memory and to many people we know cannot fail to be full of interest. Dr. Newton's ministry at the City Temple was very brief, but he was here during critical years, and his diary shows that he filled every day to the brim. The diary is marked by the literary grace that characterizes Dr. Newton's sermons, and there is many an effective phrase exactly summing up a person or a situation. Of Mr. Lloyd George: "One felt the suggestion of cunning in his candour, despite a winning smile"; of Mrs. Asquith: "Most baffling of women, lightning and fragrance all mixed up with a smile—the lightning never striking twice in the same place"; of the Peace Conference (January 1919): "An idealist, a materialist, and an opportunist are to put the world to rights." Occasionally, however, the phrase proves a snare. We never saw S. A. Tipple, who may have been a "tiny wisp of a man," but does the same phrase describe Dr. Orchard? It may be Einstein's fault that the same thing appears differently to the American and the Englishman, but Dr. Orchard has never struck us as being particularly tiny!

From this book we should judge that Dr. Newton's strength is on the æsthetic rather than on the intellectual side. His descriptions of public men (we learn the colour of their eyes, and so forth) are almost feminine, and we have remarkable statements like "the reaction from the French Revolution was *followed* by the Evangelical Revival"! Dr. Newton no doubt proved useful as a link between the United States and this country for a time, but this book rather exaggerates the importance of the service he rendered. Concerning taste one ought not to dispute, but one should scarcely—even if referring to "many errors of my own"—say "my ministry has been a triumph from the beginning"! Again, referring to the author and a wounded officer: "He took from his pocket a tiny book . . . saying that it contained the bread, the meat, the milk, all that had kept his soul alive on the long marches and the weary waits in hospitals. I thought it was perhaps a copy of the New Testament or *The Imitation of Christ*, but

on opening it I found ten of my little prayers cut from the paper and pasted in the book." We have known ministers who would be encouraged by incidents of this kind, and some who would record them in a private diary; but Dr. Newton is surely unique in giving them to the world. We must confess that such passages have irritated us in reading a book which contains many interesting things and much good writing.

EDITOR.

The Book of Job. A Revised Text and Version by C. J. BALL, M.A., D.LITT., with Preface by C. F. BURNEY, M.A., D.LITT., Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1922. 25s.

The Book of Job. By MOSES BUTTENWIESER, Ph.D. Hodder. 1922. 20s.

Within two years there have appeared, including the two now reviewed, at least four new versions of Job, prepared independently of one another—two by American and two by English scholars. Each of these has been accompanied by introductions more or less comprehensive, and by a commentary or notes of very various degrees of fullness. On certain points all these works are in agreement: the main body of Job was written in the Persian period—if an approximate date is mentioned, it is 400 B.C.; the speeches of Elihu are a later element in the Book; the text of the book has suffered seriously in transmission. For the rest they frequently differ in details either of interpretation or of criticism.

In Professor Buttenwieser's work the translation and the Hebrew text form about a third part of the whole: the remainder consists of an Introduction of 86 pages and notes (about 140 pages), which do not apparently aim at being a complete commentary; they consist of synopses of the several speeches, justifications of emendations of the text, and some explanatory matter. In Dr. Ball's much larger work the brief Introduction and the translation occupy less than 100 pages, and are followed by nearly 400 closely packed pages of notes, printed with all the clearness and accuracy for which the Oxford Press is a guarantee. Of the wealth of learning here presented no serious student of the text of Job would willingly be deprived; no difficult word seems to be left undiscussed, no rough places of the text left without an effort to smooth them. Whether the reader accepts or rejects any or all of the emendations put forward by Dr. Ball, he will certainly find his discussion of them stimulating and illuminating.

Dr. Ball is an Assyriologist as well as a Hebraist, and for this reason his treatment of the Babylonian poem, often called "the Babylonian Job," is specially welcome. To it he devotes more than half the Introduction, giving a *transliterated text*, a translation, and a philological commentary on it, and discussing its relation to the Hebrew poem. His conclusion is cautious, viz. that the Babylonian "may perhaps exhibit the germ" of the Hebrew poem. Professor Buttenwieser, who discusses the question very briefly, dismisses the idea of any dependence, direct or indirect, of the Hebrew on the Babylonian.

The tendency to regard the Prologue and Dialogues as the work of different writers, the force and uniformity of which Professor Buttenwieser overstates, is yet sufficiently strong to justify the thorough examination to which he subjects this theory; and the long section of the Introduction devoted to it may be commended as one of his most valuable contributions. Another distinctive feature of his work is his treatment of the problems of the latter half of the book; these are numerous and difficult, and Professor Buttenwieser makes a valiant, though not, we fear, a successful, effort to overcome all or most of them at once, mainly by an extensive theory of dislocations. Apart from a multitude of other transpositions of the text, he distributes the whole of chaps. xxix–xxxi (the last speech of Job), among

earlier speeches of Job, and about half of the speeches of Elihu among speeches of Job and Bildad. The result is that chap. xxviii contains the last words of Job before God speaks : thus Job closes with a calm recognition of the inscrutable ways of God. This of course by itself would, in the usual interpretation of them, merely enhance the difficulty presented by the speeches of God. Why should God put question after question to Job, merely to reduce him to a state of mind which he has already, in the hypothesis, just reached and expressed in his last words ? The difficulty is met by a fresh interpretation : God addresses His questions not to Job, but to the three friends. A bold theory, but on most grounds improbable. Even the formal objection that God addresses not a plurality of persons, but one individual, is not adequately met. Some dislocation of this part of the text and some lacunæ, as Dr. Ball also claims, there may be, but not to the extent that Professor Buttenwieser describes. There is some interpolation, too, probably—in particular chap. xxviii, as, in common with many recent writers, Dr. Ball recognizes.

The translations in both books contain much that is happy and suggestive. Generally Dr. Ball is terser and, thanks to his great skill—or in spite of it—scarcely less clear than Professor Buttenwieser, who at times admits amplification and paraphrase. Occasionally (e.g. in 6^{16}), Professor Buttenwieser runs a whole distich into a single line, while parts of Dr. Ball's version are printed in " quatrains." Some of these are certainly merely apparent, and not real ; 7^{4} as emended might have been a quatrain, though Dr. Ball does not so treat it, but the eight lines of 7^{3-5} do not become two real quatrains, because Dr. Ball can print them with a space after the fourth line. Admirable as Professor Buttenwieser's translation often is, it suffers from two defects. He is apt to render the same Hebrew words by different English words so as to obscure a close connexion. Neither " rage " nor " anguish " is a good translation of *Iea'us*, but to render it first (5^{2}) by one and then (6^{2}) by the other is to blunt the point of Job's retort. Sometimes, too, highly questionable renderings are admitted (such as " ripe old age " in 5^{26}) without any warning in the notes that they are quite uncertain.

G. Buchanan Gray.

Conscription and Conscience. A History: 1916–1919. By J. W. Graham, M.A. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 12s. 6d.

This is a painful book to read, and leaves behind a keen sense of sorrow and shame. It is a startling discovery of how much stupidity and cruelty may be displayed in what boasts itself a civilized Christian community. While the writer seeks to be impartial, although all his sympathy is on one side in the struggle he records, yet the picture he presents is not the whole truth. The intentions of Parliament were to grant exemption for conscientious objectors to military service, and attempts were made by the Government, although often in a blundering way, to give effect to those intentions. There were tribunals which discharged their duties with conscience, consideration and courtesy. The War Office did endeavour to put an end to the outrages inflicted on men forced into the Army. Concern about the matter was widely felt in the Churches, and efforts were made by the Free Church Council Executive to prevent persecution and find a way out of the difficulty. The only occasion when opportunity offered, I pressed the matter on Mr. Lloyd George's attention, and I was one of a small deputation who interviewed Lord Kitchener in regard to it a few days before his fateful voyage. Mr. Graham gives the impression, qualified by a few sentences only, that the whole nation, with very few exceptions, conspired in inflicting these hardships and sufferings.

The Act was badly drawn; the manhood of the nation should not have been put into the Army; conscientious objectors should never have passed from civil control. Even where alternative service was refused and good reason could have been shown for refusing the total exemption demanded, the civil penalty of imprisonment for a limited period should have been imposed, and should once for all have purged the offence. The tribunals would have acted more wisely and justly had they granted even total exemption, unless suspicion of the sincerity of the motives was fully justified; and the Act provided for this. In many cases its administration was a scandal, showing how incompetent were the persons to whom so difficult a task and so serious a trust was committed. One's confidence in the administration of the law by the kind of men who formed these tribunals has been severely shaken. No less has military discipline and the prison system been brought into discredit; but, it must be added, had the Act been properly administered, neither in the Army nor the prisons would this insoluble problem have emerged. The main responsibility for the lamentable and disgraceful situation must be laid at the door of the Government, and, as his own declarations show, of Mr. Lloyd George. Very succesfully did he "ever consider the best means of making the path of that class a very hard one," so hard that for seventy-one that path ended in the grave, and for many others in permanent physical injury. One cannot read the record Mr. Graham has given without reaching the conviction that everything that can be done should be done to prevent another war, and that, should another war come, conscription must be resisted. If Governments knew that the Christian Church would throw its whole weight against conscription, they would be more careful not to follow ways which might lead to war.

With no lack of appreciation of the position and attitude of the conscientious objector, we cannot approve as unreservedly as Mr. Graham does all that was said and done in the sacred name of conscience. After much searching of mind, we are convinced that the absolutist position was wrong, and would lead to moral anarchy and social chaos. The individual conscience may be sincere, but it is not necessarily infallible; concerted moral reflexion, inquiry and study, are necessary to correct its aberrations. Those who refused to do what their conscience condemned as wrong—fighting and shedding blood—were absolutely right, and should have been protected. Those who refused as alternative service to do what their conscience could not consider as itself wrong, but which they persuaded themselves would be wrong because assisting a nation at war, were in our judgment mistaken and misled by unsound reasoning. But even for them there should have been toleration, as conscientiousness is not so common that it should in any way be discouraged.

It must also be admitted that the speech and behaviour of some of the objectors was not always according to the meekness and lowliness of Christ. Some were very "pugnacious pacifists," out to defy a law of which they disapproved, and to embarrass a Government to which they were opposed, rather than to find relief for their conscientious scruples. It may damage respect for conscience if it is used as a weapon in a political or an economic warfare. The perusal of the No-Conscription Fellowship's activities justifies doubts of that society felt all along. Under a close moral scrutiny, some of the devices which it adopted could not be justified. It came very near, even if it did not sometimes become, a conspiracy against the nation, at a time when the nation had a right to expect loyalty.

When we recall how much the men in the Forces endured, and the

sacrifices which the whole nation made, it may appear at first sight that only the lack of a sense of proportion could have led the writer to this exhaustive history of the conscientious objectors, their wrongs and sufferings. Sayings of the sufferers here recorded show that they did not desire to be brought into comparison with those who laid down their lives in battle. But there are also statements which show that some, while paying the price for fidelity to conscience in opposition to the nation's will, did murmur and rebel, and did not always show themselves as "splendid" as did many of the combatants. It would be a mistake, however, to regard this record as written for the sake of magnifying the sacrifice of these men. It is written as a rebuke and a warning to the nation. As the panic and the passion of war subsides, as the nation in a chastened mood begins to repent for what was done amiss in these years of strain and stress, it is to be desired that the people may hear and heed the call to repentance that this volume brings.

The Problem of War and its Solution. By JOHN E. GRANT. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 12s. 6d.

This is a pretentious book. The author promises more than he performs, and attempts more than he achieves, or is capable of achieving. He gives the impression of having read widely, but of not being a thoroughly educated man. Much of the book is written in what Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch would call "journalese and jargon." There are sentences the sense of which it would be hard to discover: they seem "sound and fury signifying nothing." Words are used in an unusual sense (e.g. *credence, assimilation*), others coined without any need (e.g. *aberrated*). Sweeping historical generalizations are made without any supporting evidence. References to authorities are for the most part absent. Abuse takes the place of argument. If the rest of the book were altogether as untrustworthy as is the account of the beginnings of Christianity, its historical survey would be worthless. Here are some examples: "There is not a single doctrine or dogma in this spurious Christianity based on the teachings of Jesus"; "One of the first to *obscure and distort* the genuine teachings of the New Prophet was Paul, upon whose philosophy was built an apocryphal theology, now known as the 'Christology of Paul'"; "Paul's initiation of the monastic habit brought terrible calamities upon those who practised the new form of captivity as well as upon their co-religionists." The solution of the Problem of War, with which the book is only partially concerned, is a new *Rule of the Land*, ownership by the State, and payment of rent to the State. There are things of interest and value in the book, and with much of its intention we agree, but the author is not competent for his task.

Post Industrialism. By A. J. PENTY. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 6s.

It is a pleasure to read a book which has a definite intention, and carries it out competently, courageously and consistently. Even if one does not agree with Mr. Penty's main contention, the volume contains a great deal which deserves careful consideration. The disease of modern industrialism is skilfully diagnosed, even if the remedy proposed should be deemed impracticable. The author maintains that it is not capitalism which is the primary cause of the evils of the present system, as Socialists assert, but the extensive use of machinery and the consequent subdivision of labour. The greater productivity of the machine is always resulting in an excess of supply over demand, and is the main cause of that evil

which the working man most dreads—unemployment. By the use of machinery work is made less interesting, because less varied; such skill as may be developed is within a narrower range; the human personality is not allowed to unfold its powers. Labour is more widely divorced from capital, and is nevertheless made more dependent upon it. In this indictment there is much calling for serious thought.

The remedy suggested includes: (1) A careful inquiry how any new machinery will affect the human factor, and the adoption only of what can pass that scrutiny. (2) The arrest of the process of subdivision of labour, and a return as far as possible to the necessary division existing before modern industrialism began. (3) The restoration of the Mediæval Guilds. This is the crucial proposal.

> "Once it is realized that the Mediæval Guilds were organizations which existed primarily for the maintenance of economic justice and equity, and that they broke down, not from any defect inherent in their constitution, but because they were never co-extensive with society, we begin to understand that one of the conditions of getting capitalism into subjection is to make Guild organization co-extensive with society" (p. 84).

"The Mediæval Guilds advocated will be concerned with the crafts, small industries and agriculture," and not, as are the National Guilds, about which there is at present much discussion, with "the large modern industry." The ideals are not opposed, but complementary. But Mr. Penty desires and expects that gradually this "large modern industry" will be superseded as the industrial system shows signs of breaking up, and be replaced by a return to the industrial type of the past. "There remains for us but one thing left to do—to concentrate our attack upon the subdivision of labour and the unrestricted use of machinery which are carrying our civilization to its destruction" (p. 157). It is manifestly impossible to discuss here whether such a change is at all probable, even if it were desirable. The value of the book lies rather in its convincing proof that it is impossible for Christianity to be content with and acquiesce in the industrial system as it now is. Whatever material benefits it may have brought, it has subordinated the man to the machine; it has substituted the desire for wages or profits for the interest in work itself as an expression of personality and as a social service; it has set in opposition the interests of the two factors in industry, capital and labour, and has thus produced a dangerous social cleavage. If the Christian Churches lend themselves to the devious devices of the politicians in allowing themselves to be alarmed by the "Labour Bogy," they will be simply trifling with an issue which has moral and religious, as well as economic and political implications, and will not be offering such a contribution as they can offer to the solution of one of the most menacing problems of the day.

The World Religion. By GILBERT T. SADLER, M.A., LL.B. Daniel. Four Volumes (various dates), 3s. 6d. each. I. The Inner Meaning of the Four Gospels. II. Behind the New Testament. III. The Infinite in the Finite. IV. The Social Expression of the Spiritual Life.

Although the author still claims to be a Congregational minister, and is supposed to share the common faith of the Congregational Churches, yet here he appears as the exponent of a new religion, superior to the Christian. Jesus never existed. A Christ group of Nazarenes rose within

Judaism about A.D. 30, and was persecuted by the Jews until A.D. 60. The Gnostic initiation story of the descended and ascended Christ was framed before A.D. 80. The "Epistles of Paul" (really by a Pauline School) appeared between A.D. 80–90. "The collection of the 'sayings' of the Christians, ascribed to Christ, but taken mostly from Jewish writings and Rabbis," was made in the next decade, into which also the Synoptic Gospels fall. Acts appeared in A.D. 110, and the "Gospel of John" in A.D. 120. Such is his reconstruction of history. Here is his theology; (1) "To-day it is needful 'to get' behind the Four Gospels to the Gnostic idea of the Christ—*logos*, not as a man, but as a Divine life descending and ascending." (2) "The World-Religion goes beyond Christianity of the Gospels in a second manner." "The World-Religion needs to gather from the West (ancient Greek and modern Anglo-Saxon ideals) as well as from the East (Buddhist and Hebrew ideals)."

In the first volume Mr. Sadler provides a running commentary on passages from the Gospels to justify his position. In the second he sketches the development of Christianity as he conceives it. In the third he expounds his doctrine of a descending and ascending God in man, the infinite in the finite; and in his last volume he condemns the existing social order as based on force, and proposes the New Social Order which will use no force, but in an extreme case of recalcitrance will resort to a boycott. The volumes display a wide learning, and very often a truly Christian spirit, but what is totally lacking is judgment. The author's dominant conception has become an obsession, which has deprived him of any critical faculty to appraise the value of evidence or the validity of argument. The treatment falls far short of what one has a right to demand and expect from one who advances so revolutionary a thesis. Modern scholarship, even of the critical and liberal tendency, is entirely against his representation of the beginning of Christianity, and he can find support for his reconstruction of that history only in a few eccentric writers of anti-Christian bias. The volumes abound in irrelevancies, repetitions, assumptions, conjectures. How any man who held the Christian faith can believe he is here offering the world something better passes my comprehension.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

Delusion and Dream. By SIGMUND FREUD; translated by H. M. DOWNEY, Allen and Unwin. 1922. 12s. 6d.

This is a characteristically Freudian work. It is a psycho-analytic study based on Wilhelm Jensen's novel *Gradiva*. First we are given a translation of *Gradiva* and then Freud's psycho-analysis of its characters. *Gradiva* is the story of a young archæologist Norbert Hanold, who falls in love with a dream-girl, whose original is the statue of a Pompeian maid represented as walking with a peculiarly graceful gait. She really stands for a subconscious reminiscence of a living girl Zoë whom he had known in his earlier youth, and whom he afterwards meets again and marries. The story is prettily told, and is just a pleasant romance. Freud treats it as a study in delusion. His analysis is acute enough, but tedious and arbitrary as is his wont. He reads into it what he wants to bring out of it, and one feels that there is almost as much delusion in the analyst as in his subject. It is quite a good example of his method, however, and much less unpleasant than some of his excursions into the same field. The discriminating reader will be able to find in it materials for illustrating both the use and abuse of the psycho-analytic method.

Miracles and the New Psychology. By E. R. Micklem, M.A., B.Litt. Oxford: Univ. Press. 1922. 7s. 6d.

It is gradually being understood that the practice of psycho-theraphy by properly qualified doctors is opening up a new era in the treatment of certain diseases. Evidence is accumulating to the effect that the power of mind over matter is far greater than had been realized, and there is no doubt that mental healing will occupy an important place in the medicine of the future. If this is so, it is obvious that we have a new standpoint from which to approach the healing miracles of Jesus Christ, and Mr. Micklem's book is an attempt to study them in the light of modern psychology and psycho-therapeutics. Let it be said at once that it is a most careful and scholarly piece of work, as welcome for its restraint and sanity as for its thoroughness. Mr. Micklem has no theories to air, and is indeed almost too reticent as to his own ideas and conclusions. He is content to let the facts speak for themselves, to put them in their setting and leave them; and it is perhaps the better way.

He begins with a brief but very comprehensive review of the present condition and recent achievements of psycho-therapeutics, and then, after shortly discussing the scriptural stories, goes on to examine in the light of the new knowledge available the various healing miracles of Jesus. He illustrates his work throughout with parallel instances drawn from both ancient and modern sources. The net result is a body of cumulative and convincing evidence to the effect that there are practically no limits to the power of suggestion in the treatment of certain diseases, especially when mediated through a commanding personality. There can be no doubt that the work Mr. Micklem has done will always have to be reckoned with in any discussion of the miracles of Jesus on the one hand, and of the personality of Jesus on the other. As we have already said, he does not lay down any dogmatic conclusions, but he has provided carefully sifted materials for which every serious student of the New Testament will be grateful. There is no doubt, too, that the whole question of the miraculous will have to be reconsidered in the light of these discussions.

W. B. Selbie.

A Student's Philosophy of Religion. By W. K. Wright, Ph.D. Hodder. 1922. 20s.

This volume is based upon lectures delivered at Cornell University during the years 1913 to 1916. The classes consisted of students repreenting numerous religious denominations, including Roman Catholics and Jews, as well as agnostics. The author has therefore made a sincere attempt at impartiality of treatment. Protestant readers, however, will be inclined to think that while Roman Catholicism receives more than its meed of justice, Protestantism seems to be "damned with faint praise." Nevertheless, it is good that we should have brought before us in objective fashion the genuine religious values that are conserved by Catholicism.

The volume is admirably arranged. Part I contains a definition of Religion together with an able survey of the history of religious development. Religion is defined as "the endeavour to secure the conservation of socially recognized values through specific actions that are believed to evoke some agency different from the ordinary ego of the individual, or from other merely human beings, and that imply a feeling of dependence upon this agency." This definition has certain excellencies, no doubt, but the difficulty here, as in many similar definitions, is to find room for primitive Buddhism. Nevertheless, the author treats early Buddhism

as a Religion, and gives an excellent account of it. In this section one misses a clear description of Animism. The author begins his account of the historical development with the Australian aborigines as representative of "Religion in its lowest terms." Many will disagree with him here.

Part II is probably the least satisfactory portion of the book. Here the psychological nature of religious experience is discussed. The crude terms introduced into psychology by the Freudian school are wisely avoided, but more use might with advantage have been made of their results. We are still waiting for a clear exposition of the bearings of the New Psychology on the psychological study of Religion.

In Part III we have a study of religious experience from the point of view of metaphysics. The author deals successively with the traditional problems, viz. Mechanism and Teleology, the Existence of God, the Problem of Evil, Human Freedom and Immortality. His account is an admirable summary of recent discussion; he presents opposing views with sympathy and understanding, and, with a rare absence of dogmatism, leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions.

The bibliographies attached to each chapter are excellent, and should enable the student to find his way with comparative ease through the literature that is relevant to each problem. Hence, while the book does not profess to be a new and original contribution to religious philosophy, it does fulfil its humbler task of furnishing a workmanlike introduction which will be useful to many others besides students.

It is a pity that all the notes, including even simple references, are gathered together at the end of the book. Notes at the best are an evil, but a necessary one sometimes, and the evil ought not to be enhanced by making the reader lose time in searching them out.

E. J. Price.

The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth. By Vincent Taylor, B.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1922. 12s. 6d.

This careful essay confines itself in the main to one aspect of the subject, namely the "literary and critical examination of the historical evidence," though its last section recognizes that "the last word is with Theology." But the historic approach tends, as far as it goes, to prepare the way for final agreement. Mr. Taylor has a trained historic mind and a good knowledge of what has already been done. His contribution, therefore, really helps towards solving the problem of the earliest evidence for the Virgin Birth of Jesus, even if he be mistaken on the very point that is the most distinctive of his essay.

This point concerns the witness of St. Luke, which is rightly made the centre of his study. He holds that, while the Third Gospel as we have it teaches the Virgin Birth, its nativity narrative was originally written on the supposition that Joseph was Jesus's father, in a natural and not a merely legal sense; but that, ere it left his hand, its author received further information from some source, and added the verses i. 34 ff., which put the whole matter in a fresh light. He urges that linguistically i. 34 ff. are Lucan, save the word (ἐπέι, not ἐπειδή, as regularly in the Lucan writings) there rendered "seeing that." But this is to overlook the greater likelihood that the style is that of the written source on which Luke i–ii is almost certainly based. That what is found in i. 34ff. was integral to the whole narrative in Luke i–ii seems demanded by the obvious superiority attributed to Jesus as compared with John, who yet is described as born out of the usual course of nature. This view fully explains the non-Lucan style of

i. 34, and also the affinity of conception between the idea of Jesus's birth as of a virgin here and in Matt. i, which our essayist brings out. That conception is not of the Græco-Roman order, but thoroughly Hebraic—a point of great importance for the religious value of the doctrine of Christ's person to which it witnesses. On the view of pre-Lucan Hellenistic authorship for the whole Nativity Story in Luke i–ii, none of the points which force our author to hold that Luke originally thought of Jesus's birth in terms of Joseph's paternity really cause difficulty. On the other hand, he has adjusted to the teaching of this source the genealogy in chap. iii due to his other source, by the editorial "as was supposed."

All this means that, while Matt. i and Luke i–ii are our earliest positive witnesses to a belief in the Virgin Birth, this belief was already embodied in a written Jewish-Christian source used from the first by Luke in compiling his Gospel. How much further can we safely go historically? Can we assume that behind the written or open local teaching in question there lay an older semi-private or family tradition, going back to Mary herself? Mr. Taylor is not prepared to answer "Yes." He sees that the very exaltation of the religious estimate of Jesus which existed from the first, but grew yet higher through the influence of such as Paul and the writer to the Hebrews, would tend to give rise to the belief simply as an inference from this spiritual fact itself, and to find seeming sanction in a prophecy like Isa. vii. 14 (cited in Matt. i. 23)—though only in the Greek, not the original Hebrew. The great thing, after all, as our author feels and says, is the witness which the Nativity Story, whatever its historical basis, affords to the religious faith kindled by the historic Jesus, and that it took such a form of expression even in Jewish Christian circles.

Mr. Taylor's work is full of promise. It is to be hoped that he will deal in like fashion with other open questions of New Testament study.

VERNON BARTLET.

The Beloved Disciple: Studies of the Fourth Gospel. By A. E. Garvie, D.D. Hodder. 1922. 7s. 6d.

There is no greater desideratum in N.T. literature than a new and adequate commentary on the Fourth Gospel. The foundations for it are being laid in an extensive series of investigations, and it is not the least merit of Dr. Garvie's book that it gives us a bibliography of recent articles contributed to various theological journals. This would have been still more helpful if it had not been confined to English periodicals. Dr. Garvie is primarily concerned here not with the theology of the Gospel (though this is not overlooked), but with its "composition, authorship and trustworthiness," and he has furnished a book for which all students will be grateful in proportion as they work over the Gospel again, verifying Dr. Garvie's references and pondering on his conclusions.

The analytic method to which we have become accustomed in O.T. studies is now being applied to the N.T. books, but despite the convincing allocation of passages to R(edactor), E(vangelist) and W(itness)—W being behind E, as Peter was behind Mark—to say nothing of the difference between W's reminiscences and his reflexions, there is a real and living unity in the Gospel. Dr. Garvie identifies the "Witness" with "the disciple whom Jesus loved," but not with the son of Zebedee. May we suggest to Dr. Garvie in the interests of clarity that he should abandon the modest designation of himself as "the writer" and boldly use the first personal pronoun singular?

The Epistle to the Hebrews: its Doctrine and Significance. By E. F. Scott, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1922. 8s.

In Peake's *Commentary* the article on "Hebrews" was contributed by Professor Scott, and it is gratifying to find that he has now produced this fuller study of the Epistle. One can give it no higher praise than to say that it is worthy to stand alongside the author's book on the Fourth Gospel. It will not, indeed it cannot, mark so decisive a point in British N.T. investigation as that work did, but the same qualities are in evidence—orderly arrangement, firm grasp of the central questions, and pellucid style. Professor Scott still maintains that the Epistle was not written to a definitely Jewish-Christian community, but is rather a "protest against tendencies which affected the Church as a whole." Among the host of suggested authors he leans most to Apollos, or at least to one like-minded; the date is nearer 85 than 70, and the recipients most likely the Church in Rome, or rather a group of its "more advanced and enlightened believers." I do not think Professor Scott has successfully countered the objection against Rome contained in the reference to comparatively light persecution. If for Rome he would substitute Ephesus, as Dr. Vernon Bartlet has recently proposed, he would carry more conviction for some of his other arguments. Ephesus, as we know, was a Church that had lost its "first love," and in other respects it seems to meet the requirements of the case. The gnosis of the Epistle would certainly not be out of place here. Or there is Corinth.

Dr. Scott has given us a book for preachers quite as much as for scholars. It is an excellent thing to have the historical value of the Epistle so clearly shown, and to rejoice in the light it sheds on the "obscure but momentous" half-century between Paul and the Fourth Evangelist. It is even better to be led by a master-guide to the fresh consideration of such themes as "The New Covenant," "The Two Ages," "The High Priesthood of Christ," and "Faith," and, in the valuable and pertinent closing paragraphs, to find confirmation and exposition of Westcott's dictum of thirty years ago, that there is no book in the N.T. that, rightly understood, has more to say to Church and nation than this.

Alex. Grieve.

Judas. By Claude Houghton. Daniel. 1922. 5s.

The Nazarene. Allen Brockington. Erskine Macdonald. 1922. 7s. 6d.

Of these two poems, *The Nazarene* does not seem of any great importance, in spite of the "jacket" which tells us that it is a poem of "arresting beauty" and "enthralling interest." The other, one of the "Plays for a People's Theatre," is a poem remarkably eloquent and with much sincere and fine thinking in it, and many dramatic moments. The two books, however, are grouped together here because they raise the same question —*how far can poets consider themselves free to play fast and loose with the Gospel story?* No one can object to the poet who takes the lovely myths of Greece and re-shapes them. But the story of Jesus is not a myth; either it is history, or the faith of Christendom is built upon sand.

Quite clearly, as all historians would agree, these authors take great liberties with the Gospels; they feel at liberty to reconstruct the story, to read between the lines, and to discover in the minds of the actors thoughts and emotions which are entirely out of the part. It seems as though such writers have tacitly assumed that the names and the situations in the Gospel are available for all who wish an arresting setting for their picture of the clash of human personalities.

Sometimes the devout are the worst offenders. They feel that they can make a modern psychological romance out of the gospel. It cannot be done; and Christian people ought to ask themselves whether they should not lay it down that it ought not to be attempted by those who add to their faith reverence.

There are writers, indeed, who know how to let their imagination play upon the story reverently. Mr. Masefield's *Good Friday* belongs to a different range of literature from that to which *Judas* belongs. One word must be said about Judas, who is the favourite character among such writers. There is a natural desire always to mitigate the horror of his character. But there is not a shadow either of evidence or of probability for the reconstruction which Mr. Houghton gives. Much reading of these imaginative works upon the gospel leaves the reader thankful for the austerity and reserve of the sacred writers.

It may even be suggested to the great imaginative minds that without departing from the historical realities of the New Testament there are themes waiting for them. Modern study of the origins of our Faith has left us with a knowledge of Jesus, and a vision of His earthly life, strange and wonderful. That really historical Jesus has not yet been discovered by artists or poets. When they discover Him they "will be amazed, and when they are amazed they will reign."

Other Verse received.

The Soul's Adventure. By John Shelburne. Erskine Macdonald. 1922. 5s.

The Way of the Heart. By Belfrage Gilbertson. Erskine Macdonald. 1922. 5s.

Myths of Ífè. By John Wyndham. Erskine Macdonald. 1922. 5s.

E. Shillito.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST

Tertullian. Concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh. (Translations of Christian Literature.) By A. Souter, D.Litt. S.P.C.K. 1922. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Souter having already translated Tertullian's Treatises *De Oratione, De Baptismo* and *Adversus Praxean*, now turns to the important work *De Carnis Resurrectione*, a subject in which interest has been revived by a recent heresy charge in the Anglican Church. A brief but sufficient introduction, containing a detailed list of Tertullian's works and a summary of the argument of the tractate, is followed by the translation, of which it is sufficient to say that it is marked by the exact and careful scholarship that we have come to expect from Dr. Souter. An appendix gives a collation of a recently discovered MS. (formerly of Clairvaux) of this and other treatises with the text of Kroymann's standard edition. In this collation there is evident the same thoroughness, industry, and competence that all who use Dr. Souter's New Testament text know well. We notice that the translator has to name German and French writers as being the best authorities on Tertullian's language, theology and New Testament citation. Had Alan Gaunt been spared us, perhaps by this time a British name would have suggested itself in this connexion.

Types of Preachers in the New Testament. By A. T. Robertson, D.D. Hodder. 1922. 6s.

Dr. Robertson is a prolific writer—the jacket gives a list of twenty-four books he has already published, and a later one from his pen is noticed elsewhere. He is also a learned scholar, his degrees stretching half-way across the printed page. This volume has indications of both these facts. It shows wide reading and sound scholarship on the one hand, but on the other traces of haste in that there is not the slightest attempt at literary finish, the chapters having the appearance of jottings from the author's notebooks.

The volume is a useful one for ministers to have on their shelves, but it is also a dangerous one ; it states all the facts about the selected characters, and leaves so little for the minister to do himself.

Dr. Robertson is shrewd as well as learned, and he says many wise things about modern Church life. Diotrephes believed that " if he was not chairman of all the committees, he must be regarded as an ex-officio member ! " The last page is a powerful plea for recruits for the ministry and for ministerial superannuation.

If Dr. Robertson would put his writings into literary form, their value and usefulness would be greatly increased.

Lectures on the Apocalypse. By R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D. Humphrey Milford (for the British Academy). 1922. 6s.

Many ministers who could not afford to buy Dr. Charles's *Commentary on the Apocalypse* will welcome these Schweich Lectures. In the Preface Dr. Charles replies somewhat tartly to critics of the *Commentary* : " most of their objections have been due to a very incomplete knowledge alike of the manifold problems of the Apocalypse and of Apocalyptic ! "

These three lectures are packed with information, and offer a valuable summary of Dr. Charles's conclusions as well as a fascinating glimpse of his methods. They should be carefully read by all students and ministers who have not the larger work at hand or the time for its study.

The King of Love. By J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. Nisbet. 1922. 5s.

An exposition of the Twenty-Third Psalm, the meditation on each verse being preceded by a rendering of the psalm (by Sir H. W. Baker, James Montgomery, Addison, Thomas Roberts, Isaac Watts, and from the Scottish Psalter of 1650). The volume is intended for devotional reading, and many will find it helpful. We are sorry to see that Dr. Jones does not retain the " Shepherd " figure through the whole psalm ; a change of figure at verse 5 seems to us to destroy the psalm's unity and mar its beauty.

Our Faith in God through Jesus Christ. By J. E. Davey, M.A., B.D. Student Christian Movement. 1922. 3s. 6d.

Religious Perplexities. By L. P. Jacks, D.D., D.Litt. Hodder. 1922. 2s. 6d.

Professor Davey's four chapters answer the questions whether the Christian faith is reasonable, necessary, effective and final. It is unfortunate for the writer that much of this ground has been covered in Dr. D. S. Cairns's *The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith*, one of the most effective pieces of apologetic in recent years. We fear that Professor Davey will suffer from the inevitable comparison.

The Editor of the *Hibbert Journal* prints here two lectures, with an unspoken introduction, a fact we learnt from the Preface after reading the book. The introductory chapter we had found clever but disappointing,

the next stimulating and suggestive, and the last roused in us an enthusiasm that made us envy those fortunate enough to hear it delivered. Dr. Jacks writes with his usual clarity, and his call to "put a cheerful courage on" in face of life and its perplexities will find an echo in many breasts. We hope the little book will be widely read.

The Imprisoned Splendour. By MURDOCH MACKINNON, M.A., D.D. Allenson. 1922. 3s. 6d.

The worst thing about this book is the title it has borrowed. It consists of addresses on Phil. iv. 8, that on "Whatsoever things are of good report," dealing with "The Myth of a Free Press" in very straightforward fashion.

A Call to Reunion. By VISCOUNT HALIFAX. Mowbray. 1922. 2s.

Free Churchmen who are inclined to think that union with the Anglican Church is not far away would be well advised to read this book, which enables us to see clearly that the eyes of many Anglicans are turned, not in our direction at all, but to Communions whose fundamental conceptions are altogether remote from ours.

Viscount Halifax visited Cardinal Mercier at Malines last October, and afterwards submitted to him a memorandum on reunion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. This memorandum is now printed, with the Cardinal's views on it. The discussion is then considered in the light of the Cardinal's Pastoral Letter, describing the election of Pius XI to the Papacy. This letter forms the most interesting part of the book. In it the Cardinal describes very vividly the imposing unity of the Roman Church, with its thousand bishops, hundreds of thousands of priests, and 300,000,000 people, all accepting enthusiastically and obediently the chosen Pope.

Woodrow Wilson, as I Knew Him. By J. P. TUMULTY. Heinemann. 1922. 16s.

The Washington Conference. By MARK SULLIVAN. Heinemann. 1922. 12s. 6d.

The hero is described by his valet, the President by his private secretary. Although Mr. Tumulty is inclined to exaggerate his own influence, he does give us a real glimpse of the President at work. Defending his master from the oft-repeated charges—that he has a "one-track mind," that he refuses to accept advice, that he chooses inferior men that his pre-eminence may be unquestioned—he concludes that there is "no franker or more open-minded man nor one less dogmatic in his opinions than Woodrow Wilson."

The volume brings out well the President's policy in leading the heterogeneous mass of people of the States into the war. The foolish criticisms of the British Press at the President's delay would never have been levelled had the writers either understood Wilson's task, followed his Mexican policy, or known his character and mode of working. Any careful reader of Wilson's *Life of Washington* could prophesy almost every time the next step the President would take in 1916 and 1917.

Mr. Tumulty's sketch is not history. It pre-supposes much knowledge on the part of the reader, and it is very uneven and deals with selected episodes only; but it is an interesting study of the President by one who had opportunities of observing him closely.

"One sows, another reaps." Although "dyed in the wool" Republicans will not believe it, the Washington Conference would not have been

summoned by President Harding had not his predecessor been the promoter of the League of Nations. Mr. Sullivan is a journalist, and his story of the Conference manages to convey to the reader something of the excitement and the drama of an eventful twelve weeks. His sketches of the personalities of the Conference are clear and revealing, but we miss an examination of its results. Is the limitation of capital ships a step in the direction of peace, or does it simply mean naval authorities are putting their trust in other means? It is clear that the achievements of the Conference must be the prelude to more drastic steps in the direction of disarmament if the world is to be kept at peace.

Khama. By JOHN CHARLES HARRIS. Livingstone Press. 1922. 1s.
Pearls of the Southern Seas. By V. A. BARRADALE, M.A. Livingstone Press, 1922. 1s.

Khama (the great African Chief) is one of the brightest jewels in the missionary's crown, and his biography makes inspiring reading. Some of its chapters ought to be printed separately as a boys' book, for all boys would thrill at the story of this grand old man. It is with regret that we notice that Mr. Harris charges the Episcopal Church of South Africa with sectarian propaganda carried to the extent of depreciating Khama's character and work. Surely at this time of the day any Church would prevent action of this kind on the part of its zealots! Such things make Church union impossible.

No one is better qualified to write a handbook of life on Polynesia than Mr. Barradale, who recently visited the sphere of his former labours. His little volume is very well illustrated, and has a useful chronology.

Henry Martyn. By CONSTANCE E. PADWICK. Student Christian Movement. 1922. 5s.

It is good to learn that the United Council of Missionary Education is co-operating with those enterprising publishers, the Student Christian Movement, in the preparation of a series of missionary biographies. Miss Padwick's volume opens the series worthily, and many who find the pious terminology of the Clapham sect irritating will nevertheless be inspired by this account of one of the most devoted of missionaries. A useful table of dates, which enables us to relate Martyn's life to the events of the time, is prefixed.

Joseph Compton-Rickett. Edited by A. COMPTON-RICKETT. Cooper, Bournemouth. 1922. 8s. 6d.

Many Congregationalists will welcome this memoir of an ex-Chairman of the Union, who gave himself without stint to the service of the Free Churches. The volume, which has several excellent photographs, reveals what a versatile personality Sir Joseph Compton-Rickett was. Laymen of his standing and ability ready to serve the Church of Christ in the pulpit, on the platform, and in the committee-room are all too few, and, strangely enough, they are always to be found among the busiest of men. Mr. Lloyd George contributes a foreword, the editor a sketch of his father's character and of his achievements as a man of letters; Katherine Tynan writes an appreciation of his poetry, Dr. Scott Lidgett of his public work, and the Rev. George Hooper of Sir Joseph as preacher, politician and host. The volume concludes with selected passages from published writings. Many lesser men could have testified to Sir Joseph's thoughtfulness and generosity. We believe he rarely visited a manse without leaving "something for the children" or "to buy a book."

Readers and Writers, 1917–1921. A. R. ORAGE. Allen & Unwin. 1922. 7s. 6d.

It must be almost as difficult to write a weekly causerie like those represented here as to prepare two sermons ! To trot out something with " snap " in it, to say at least one smart thing, to discover fresh subjects and treat them in a fresh way, must grow in difficulty with the years. But Mr. Orage has the trick, and many readers of *The New Age* will welcome his articles in book form. And, of course, if inspiration should fail some week, it is always possible to find something to " satisfy the almost general demand for more serious, more outspoken, and even more savage criticism." Supplying that demand evidently gives Mr. Orage much pleasure.

The Orthodox Devil. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Jenkins. 1922. 2s. 6d.

These articles and stories of the veteran Methodist preacher aim at showing that orthodoxy without brotherliness, and religion without love, are cruel things. John Wesley provides the peg on which the book is hung : " It is impossible to imagine that the devil has any erroneous opinions."

The Best I Remember. By ARTHUR PORRITT. Cassell. 1922. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Arthur Porritt, of the *Christian World*, has moved among Free Churchmen so long and so intimately that the best he remembers cannot fail to be full of interest, especially when it is related with gusto and journalistic skill. A book on the worst that Mr. Porritt remembers would be decidedly exciting ! These reminiscences cover the last thirty years, and most of the leading Congregationalists of the time are mentioned. There are many good stories, and some chestnuts, though we do not see why Mr. Porritt fails to give the story of a ministerial golfer he mentions, who, after playing all the week and reaching the semi-final of the County Amateur Championship, began the lesson on Sunday thus :—

" The heavens declare the glory of God
And the firmament sheweth His *handicap*."

Conception Control and its Effects on the Individual and the Nation. By LADY BARRETT. John Murray. 1922. 2s.

A timely little book, for which the Archbishop of Canterbury writes a Foreword. Lady Barrett believes that public teaching on contraceptives is detrimental to public health and public morality, and that " for mothers and children it is very desirable that no contraceptives should be used in the early years of married life." She also holds that methods of conception control are most easily assimilated and effectively practised by those classes of the community likely to produce the healthiest and most intelligent children, and that therefore their advocacy leads inevitably to national degeneration.

Don'ts for Church Organists. By JOHN NEWTON. Second edition. Cambridge. Heffer. 1922. 1s.

Nonconformist Church Music. By JOSEPH WOOD. Lindsey Press, 1921. 2s. 6d.

In the first of these books, " Church " means Church of England, and the writer has emphatic views on matters liturgical. A young Church of England organist will find the book useful, and others can obtain an occasional hint.

Mr. Wood's book consists of talks to ministers and theological students, and his knowledge of the subject and his ministerial experience give him the right to be heard. Worship in most Nonconformist churches would benefit greatly were ministers and organists to read these pages and act on the advice given.

Voltaire. By J. M. ROBERTSON. Watts. 1922. 3s. 6d. and 2s.

Mr. Robertson writes this new volume in the "Life Stories of Famous Men" Series with his usual ability, and ignorance of the great French *philosophes* is now so general that a sketch like the present one is very welcome. The bias of the writer is so plain that the reader does not need to be warned against it. The recipe seems to be: "Find anything deserving of special censure in the past, and then prefix the word 'Christian.'" Thus we get "the Christian social code," "the Christian social system," and so forth.

Mazzini: Patriot and Prophet. By ARTHUR RUDMAN. Epworth Press. 1922. 5s.

This sketch, by a Wesleyan minister, of Mazzini's life and writings, is intended, not to supersede Bolton King's classic biography, but to reveal and interpret its subject to the present age. At a time when Mazzini is rarely mentioned, when reformers speak little about the duties of man and, to use Mazzini's words, "substitute the problem of humanity's kitchen for the problem of humanity," the volume is not out of place. It is interestingly written, though there is some repetition. A brief bibliography is added.

Sou'westers. Stories of Devon and Cornwall. By NICHOLAS OLIVER. Allenson. 1922. 3s. 6d.

The minister of Camberwell Green Congregational Church aims at doing for the fishermen of Cornwall and Devon what Ralph Connor has done for the backwoodsmen of Canada. These nineteen short stories remind us not so much of Connor as of Ian Maclaren and the Kailyard School. They are well written, and have considerable emotional power, but we question whether life, even in Cornwall and Devon, is quite so idyllic as these stories suggest.

The Call of the Dawn. By LILLIE LE PLA. C. W. DANIEL. 1922. 7s.

This novel deals with life in Congregational churches a generation ago, but if Miss Le Pla has not been as unfortunate in the Congregationalists she has met and the churches she has known as was Mrs. Oliphant, her picture is somewhat of a caricature. Incidentally, although we are not without knowledge of the precocity of some children—and the children of Congregational ministers in particular—we find it hard to believe that any child of twelve ever talked as does Reine on p. 17.

Also Received.

The Golden Rule. By WALTER WALSH, D.D. Daniel. 1920. 3s. 6d.

The Crucible of Experience. By S. M. BERRY, M.A. Allenson. 1920. 7s. 6d.

The Faith of a Man To-Day. By G. S. RUSSELL, M.A. Daniel. 1921. 3s. 6d.

The Art of Life. By A. F. CROSS. Daniel. 1922. 2s.

PERIODICALS

The Holborn Review (Oct.) maintains its high standard. The Rev. A. V. Murray finds in Canon Hunter's life of his father the starting-point for a suggestive article on "The Foolishness of Preaching"; the Rev. W. H. Kent writes on psycho-analysis, which now, like the poor, is always with us; the Rev. E. B. Storr gives his experience of study circles, and Dr. Beet a review of Vol. III of the *Cambridge Mediæval History*. Mrs. Herman contributes a study of Sufism under the title of "The Way of the East," and Professor C. H. Herford an illuminating sketch of Shelley. Many readers will turn first to the

Editor's third article on Recent N.T. Literature, a most useful and welcome survey. The reviews of current literature are, as usual, well done.

The Hibbert Journal (Oct.) proclaims its universality alike by the subjects of its articles and by the domiciles of the writers, one of whom is a Calcutta Professor, and four (including a retired Bengal Civil servant) hailing from the United States. Professor Radhakrishnan writes on "The Heart of Hinduism" and Mr. Johnston on "Karma and Liberation." Dr. G. G. Coulton, a modern "hammerer of the Papists," prints Dollinger's letter, written at the age of eighty-eight, refusing to recant. Mr. J. R. Mozley, in "Antitheses in Christianity," examines the relation of Christianity to persecution; Professor Baillie investigates "The True Grounds of Theistic Belief," and Dr. B. W. Bacon "Parable and Its Adaptation in the Gospels." Social problems are represented by Mr. J. A. R. Marriott's article (see our editorial pages) and by Mr. R. H. Tawney's survey of the attitude of sixteenth-century Protestantism to usury; literature and the drama by contributions from Dr. J. Moffatt and Mr. Poel; and science by Mr. Reinheimer's interesting paper on "Co-operation Among Natural Species." Mr. Austin Hopkinson shows his usual independence in "Relativity and Revelation," and there is a learned account of the Eleusinian and Orphic Mysteries from Mr. B. G. A. Fuller. The usual survey of philosophical literature by Dr. Dawes Hicks and twenty pages given to the notice of half a dozen books conclude an interesting number.

The Pilgrim (Oct.) also deals with psycho-analysis, the Editor writing an article on "Coué and St. Paul," the burden of which is: "What Coué calls Imagination I call Will; what he calls Will, I call Self-Consciousness. It is the Will which wins." Mr. Ramsey Muir writes interestingly on "The Moral Basis of Liberalism," and Mr. D. C. Somervell on "Art, Ritual, and Religion," and there are thoughtful theological articles by Canon Quick, Canon J. R. Darbyshire, and the Rev. T. J. Hardy. An article on "The Church and The Town," by Canon Newsom, claims that the Church has not "adapted its work to the new era of great towns, where the index of communicants is 4 per cent., and the proportion of clergy to people 1 : 3,335." So far as we can see, there is not a single sentence to indicate the existence of Christians other than Anglicans in the towns, or of ministers other than Anglican clergy. "The Church" throughout means, not the Church of Christ, but the Church of England, and such is its connotation in a sentence like the following: "Is there a single town in England in which the Church as a whole is organized to deal with the community as a whole?" The Bishop of Manchester, we believe, is interested in the Manchester Council of Christian Congregations, and in all approaches to Christian unity. We should be glad if he would send his contributor a copy of the Lambeth Appeal to remind him that there are Christians who do not belong to the Church of England.

The Modern Churchman (Oct. and Nov.).—The Editor would no doubt be relieved when his Conference number escaped another newspaper "stunt." The Conference theme was "Christianity as the World Religion," and most of the papers are printed here. We need only mention some of the authors—Professor P. Gardner, Rev. C. W. Emmet, Miss Dougall, Dr. R. H. Charles, and Professor W. R. Matthews—to make clear that the issue is well worth reading. Congregationalism is represented by Dr. Selbie ("Christianity and the Future"), and the veteran missionary, the Rev. Edwin Greaves ("Hinduism").

The November issue has some interesting comments on "Signs of the Times," and on the relation of the Church to the Civil Courts. Dr. Rashdall writes on "The Present Value of Creeds," and there are sketches of Swedish Church Life and of Schweitzer's work in Africa. The two articles which will secure most attention are Dr. C. C. J. Webb's on "A Century of Anglican Theology"—which pays a tribute to Oxford Nonconformity, and should be read at the same time as Dr. Selbie's article in our own pages—and a fascinating and illuminating account by a parish clergyman of his life and work. "The Lord of Thought" receives a long review.

The Church Quarterly Review (Oct.).—We turned with interest to the Russian Professor Glubokovsky's article on "Union, Intercommunion, and the Lambeth Conference," and to the Bishop of Peterborough's "The Catholicism

of the Future." Verily, the Anglican Church is "in a strait betwixt two"! Dr. Headlam writes on Dr. Gore's "Belief in God," and Dr. Caldecott on Professor Leuba's book on the same subject. Professor Box's article on "Judaism and Hellenism" deserves careful reading, as does an article on "The Trinities of Non-christian Religions." There are other articles, a review of Mr. Bosanquet's latest book by Dr. C. C. J. Webb, and many short notices.

The Interpreter (Oct.).—The Editor opens with comments on Baron von Hügel's "Philosophy of Religion," and sets a high level for his contributors, among whom are well-known scholars like Miss Dougall ("The Spirit in the Church"), Professor Matthews ("Matter and Spirit"), and the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson ("The Lordship of Jesus"). Mr. E. E. Kellett believes that Paul had an actual letter from the Galatian Church before him when he wrote our Galatians, and that its very words can be gathered from our epistle. Other interesting articles concern the Christian means of grace, the relation of religion to fact, the Atonement, and the Authority of the Church. Mr. Carney contributes *Orientalia*, and there is one review.

The Yale Review (Oct.).—It is impossible to give even the briefest list of the feast of good things provided in this number. Literature, politics, music, history and science, are all represented, and there are several pages of verse. A first-hand account of life under the Bolsheviki is of interest, as is a characteristic essay on "The Fringe of Words," by Dr. Henry van Dyke. Dr. F. E. Clark, of C.E. fame, writes on "The Menace of the Sermon," suggesting that the decline in church attendance is due to the fact that people worship the sermon rather than God.

The Harvard Theological Review (July) consists almost entirely of a learned and well-documented article by Dr. La Piana on "Recent Tendencies in Roman Catholic Theology." The writer makes a real addition to our knowledge on a subject on which most of us are all too ignorant. The only other article is by Mr. Sperry, of the Central Congregational Church, Boston, on "The Call to the Ministry." A few pages are devoted to Notes.

The Expository Times (Oct.-Nov.).—We mourn the loss of the Editor and shall miss his touch. The proofs of the November issue were found on his desk, and it contains the usual features. Dr. Garvie writes suggestively on "The Nature of Redemption," and Dr. Bartlet gives his final conclusions on the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author of whom he believes to be Apollos, the destination Ephesus. Rev. A. J. Gossip has one of the meditations for which we now look with expectancy, and Dr. W. L. Davidson writes on Sir G. A. Smith. Dr. A. T. Clay and Prof. Sayce represent Oriental Scholarship.

The Friends Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month) manifests the well-known interest taken by the Friends in education. Two addresses by Mabel T. Harrod and H. G. Wood on educational subjects are printed, and two papers on the ideals of Sanderson of Oundle. C. H. Cohen reminds Quakers of their heritage in worship, and an ex-Congregational minister, A. S. Le Mare, of the need for aggression and more "seeking." An Anglican lady (sister of Mr. C. R. Buxton, M.P.) explains why she cannot be a Friend, and H. M. Wallis is amusing on Literary Piracy. R. H. Soltau's informing article on French parties and policies deserved better proof-reading.

One who owes much to the **John Rylands' Library, Manchester,** finds it a pleasure to commend Vol. VII, No. 1, of its Bulletin (July 1922), a journal of which any academic institution or learned society might be proud.

Our readers generally will find Professor Herford's "Some Approaches to Religion through Poetry" the most interesting article, for poetry really means literature throughout—Browning, Tennyson, Arnold, Clough, Masefield, Chesterton, Wells, Francis Thompson, Tolstoy, Dostoyevski, Andreyev, Nietzsche, Bergson, William James, Paul Claudel, and Jules Romains being mentioned in the survey.

[*All books and periodicals reviewed in this Journal can be obtained from the Book-room of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E.C.* 4.]